

Rostislav Ulyanovsky

National Liberation

Essays on Theory
and Practice



MOSCOW

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

Translated from the Russian by
David Fidlon and Yuri Shirokov

Designed by *Vladimir Anokhin*

Ростислав Ульяновский

ОЧЕРКИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ОСВОБОДИТЕЛЬНОЙ БОРЬБЫ.

Вопросы теории и практики

На английском языке

First printing 1978

© Издательство „Наука“ 1976 г.

English translation of the revised Russian text

© Progress Publishers 1978

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

У $\frac{170105-086}{014(01)-78}$ —83—78

CONTENTS

Problems of Theory

Marx, Engels and Lenin on the National and the Colonial Questions	7
The Political Line of the Marxists-Leninists in the National Liberation Struggle of the Peoples of the East	36
The Genesis of the Marxist-Leninist Conception of Non-Capitalist Development	84
The Significance of the Solution of the National Question in the USSR for the Developing Countries	108
Some Features of a Socialist-Oriented National-Democratic State	151
United Anti-Imperialist Front of Progressive Forces	166
International Detente and the Developing Countries	192
The Revolutionary Process in Asian and African Countries	208

India

Jawaharlal Nehru	239
The Indian Revolutionary Emigration in Soviet Russia	256

The New Burma

The Programme of National Resurrection	265
The Burmese People in Search of a Path Towards Social Progress	280
The Results of the First Decade	291

The Embattled Africa

The Final Stage of the Collapse of Colonialism	305
--	-----

The Characteristics of the Current Stage of the National Liberation Movement	312
The Struggle Against Colonialism and Racism	327
Angola's Concerns and Hopes	356
The Battle of Ideas over the Ways of Socio-Economic Development	376
Subject Index	387
Name Index	394
Geographical Names	396

Problems of theory

Marx, Engels and Lenin on the National and the Colonial Questions

Karl Marx formulated his views on the national and the colonial questions at the outset of his revolutionary activity.

At the time the economic map of Europe was a motley picture. Some West European countries (Britain, France and the Netherlands) had already made considerable progress along the capitalist road having passed through the stage of the bourgeois revolution long before their neighbours. In the period of mass national movements which began in Central and Eastern Europe these more advanced capitalist countries already had a formed proletariat which was aware of its class interests and had begun to struggle against the bourgeoisie. But the majority of countries in Central and Eastern Europe were still on the threshold of the bourgeois revolution. Among these countries Germany was relatively more developed. She had a fairly numerous proletariat which had to assume the task of leading the democratic revolution and promoting the struggle for its subsequent victory under the conditions of Prussia of that period which was the mainstay of the Holy Alliance in Western Europe.

The development of capitalism in Britain, France and in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and the struggle against territorial economic and political fragmentation gave rise to national movements, because, according to Lenin, in order to secure a complete victory of commodity production "the bourgeoisie must capture the home market, and there

must be politically united territories whose population speak a single language".*

The development of capitalism, i.e. the final replacement of the old, feudal-serf mode of production by a new mode of production, was also a process of the rise and formation of nations as an historical category which came into being simultaneously with the emergence of capitalism. The elimination of the economic isolation of individual regions, the sundering of patriarchal-serf, family, tribal and clan ties, the gradual growth and improvement of communications, the development of the social division of labour and economic specialisation of individual regions, the penetration of commodity-money relations into the subsistence economy and their gradual transformation into capitalist relations—in a word, the formation of economic community as distinct from the division, isolation and separatism characteristic of a feudal society—became the economic basis for the rise and spread of mass national movements which also involved the peasants, the most numerous and sluggish section of the population, in the struggle for political freedom in general and for the rights of the nation in particular.

It was the epoch of the rise of the bourgeois-democratic society and state. Engels characterised this process of the formation of nations and nationalities as follows: "Since the end of the Middle Ages, history has been working towards the formation of large national states in Europe... With the development of commerce, agriculture, industry and thereby of the social might of the bourgeoisie, national feelings rose everywhere and partitioned as well as oppressed nations demanded unity and independence." **

That accounted for the fact that the solution of the national question under the conditions of the existence of "partitioned as well as oppressed nations" was one of the most important aims of the bourgeois-democratic revolution at the time. At the end of the first half and then throughout the second half of the 19th century the national question was on the agenda of the European and, particularly, of the German revolution. This was due to the influence of the partition of Poland, the 1846 insurrection in Cracow and the national movements in Hungary,

* V. I. Lenin, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 396.

** Frederick Engels, "The Role of Force in History", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1973, p. 377.

Italy and Ireland and, last but not least, the influence of the historically imminent national unification of Germany which was then the centre of bourgeois-democratic and national movements in Europe. It was natural, therefore, that the founders of Marxism closely followed and studied these acute and steadily growing mass national movements which were a component part of a series of bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the leading countries of Central and Eastern Europe at that time.

In the first place Marx and Engels rejected the bourgeois approach to the study of the national question, the nature, conditions, forms and consequences of national movements, which was based on such abstract principles as "morality", "freedom" and "justice", and tackled it from the standpoint of the concrete historical interests of the proletariat's revolutionary class struggle for its immediate and ultimate aims. They wrote in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: "The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole."*

The founders of scientific communism approached the solution of the national question from concrete historical positions analysing each national movement in direct context with the proletariat's class struggle and aims. "Developing capitalism," Lenin wrote, "knows two historical tendencies in the national question."** The first is characterised by the awakening of national life and mass national movements, a desire to wipe out national oppression and create independent national states. Precisely this tendency was predominant in Central and Eastern Europe in the first and the beginning of the second half of the 19th century. The aims of the national liberation movement closely intertwined with the tasks that faced the proletariat, inasmuch as the national movements in Germany, Hungary, Poland and Italy exacerbated its class struggle against the

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", *Selected Works*, in three volumes. Vol. 1, Moscow, 1977, p. 120.

** V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 27.

bourgeoisie. Developing Marx's presentation of the national question Lenin wrote in the epoch of imperialism, when the national question had merged with the colonial question and had become a component part of the socialist revolution, that demands for national self-determination had to be subordinated precisely to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat and that it was this condition that distinguished the Marxist approach to the national question from the bourgeois-democratic one.

The second historical tendency in the national question under conditions of developing capitalism was the development and growing frequency of "international intercourse in every form", the break-down of national barriers, and the creation of the "international unity of capital, of economic life in general".

"Both tendencies," Lenin wrote, "are a universal law of capitalism. The former predominates in the beginning of its development, the latter characterises a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society."* The former is characterised by the "awakening of national movements" and the "drawing of the peasants" into them, while the latter is characterised by the rapprochement and intermingling of nations that have already been fully drawn into commercial intercourse. The former brings the antagonism between democracy and absolutism into the forefront, while the latter "brings the antagonism between internationally united capital and the international working-class movement into the forefront". Making this point Lenin wrote: "Of course, the two periods are not walled off from each other; they are connected by numerous transitional links...." **

Marx showed the role played by the national question in the proletarian revolution when he presented the Irish question in connection with the tasks of the British proletariat, and also when he defined the tasks of the German proletariat in the 1848 national-democratic revolution in Germany whose ultimate aim, he believed, was to develop into a socialist revolution.

Marx's presentation of the national question in which he formulated the proletariat's politically specific and independent position towards Germany's national unification, was diametrically opposite both in form and content to the stand of the

* V.I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 27.

** V.I. Lenin, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 401.

ideologues of the Prussian bourgeoisie: the latter feared a consistent democratic revolution and lauded "national society", "national justice" and "national unity". This was done in an effort to foist bourgeois ideology and the interpretation of the concept "nation" upon the working class, subordinate the proletariat's class interests to the interests of the bourgeoisie and create at least a semblance of the harmony of classes.

In Europe the development of capitalism brought the struggle for the national unification and liberation of Germany, Poland, Italy, Hungary and Ireland into the forefront.

As they struggled both against the ideologues of Prussian bourgeois nationalism and the left doctrinairism and petty-bourgeois anarchism of the Proudhonists, the founders of Marxism formulated the proletariat's independent tasks in this issue, proceeding from the fact that "without restoring autonomy and unity to each nation, it will be impossible to achieve the international union of the proletariat, or the peaceful and intelligent co-operation of these nations toward common aims".*

Marx performed a great service above all by arming the working class with a precise understanding, a sure criterion of the essence of the national movements from the point of view of the proletariat's historical tasks. What is this criterion? Let us turn to Marx himself for the answer, and first of all to his remarks about Poland.

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx and Engels wrote: "In Poland they [the Communists — *Ed.*] support the party that insists on an agrarian revolution as the prime condition for national emancipation, that party which fomented the insurrection of Cracow in 1846."** Here the founders of Marxism indicated that Poland's national liberation was indissolubly connected with the peasants' struggle against feudal oppression. Thus the revolutionary struggle of the "*agrarian democracy*—the only form of democracy possible [at the time — *R. U.*] in Eastern Europe—against *patriarchal feudal absolutism*"*** was recognised as the pivot of the national revolutionary movement.

* Frederick Engels, Preface to the Italian Edition of 1893 of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 107.

** Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 137.

*** Frederick Engels, "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 351.

In assessing the Polish national movement the founders of Marxism were mainly concerned with accelerating the development of the European revolution and regarded the revolution in Poland as a powerful spur to the revolutions in Russia and Germany. Poland, they wrote, "became a revolutionary part of Russia, Austria and Prussia.... Even the nobility, which was in part still feudal, supported the democratic-agrarian revolution with quite unprecedented selflessness. Poland had already become the focus of East-European democracy, when Germany was still floundering in the ideology of the most insipid constitutionalism and high-flown philosophy."

"So long, therefore, as we help to subjugate Poland, so long as we keep part of Poland fettered to Germany, we shall remain fettered to Russia and to the Russian policy, and shall be unable to eradicate patriarchal feudal absolutism in Germany. The creation of a democratic Poland is a primary condition for the creation of a democratic Germany."*

When Marx formulated the Polish question, he took into account the fact that the agrarian revolution in Poland was the pivot of the national liberation movement, that the victory of the national liberation movement in Poland and her restoration on genuinely democratic foundations would weaken tsarist Russia which was the bastion of feudal reaction, that the disintegration of the Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria and Prussia which jointly plundered and oppressed Poland would be a most favourable prerequisite for the development and expansion of the proletarian class struggle in Germany and for transforming Germany from the stronghold of European reaction into an ally and mainstay of republican Europe where the British and the French proletariat was already engaged in a broad class struggle for political domination.

Enlarging upon Marx's point of view, Engels tied up Poland's national liberation with the victory of the German revolution and with the interests of the democratic revolution in Russia. He wrote: "Poland's restoration is particularly important for two peoples: for the Germans and the Russians themselves.

"A people which oppresses other peoples cannot itself be free. The strength it needs to suppress another people in the long run

* Frederick Engels, "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 373, 351.

turns against it.... Poland's independence and the revolution in Russia depend on each other." He noted that Poland's independence and a revolution in Russia would help the German workers because "the bourgeoisie and the government of Germany, in a word, the German reaction would rely solely on its own forces with which we shall be able to cope ourselves eventually".*

Sixty years later Lenin, in a polemic against some of the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party who had failed to see the radical change that had taken place in the development of capitalism and the proletariat's class struggle and ignored the Marxist, i.e. a concrete historical and proletarian class approach to the national movement, confirmed Marx's and Engels' basic propositions. He wrote: "*In those times* Poland as a whole, not only the peasantry, but even the bulk of the nobility, was revolutionary.... *In those times* complete victory for democracy in Europe was indeed impossible without the restoration of Poland. *In those times* Poland was indeed the bulwark of civilisation against tsarism, and the vanguard of democracy."**

Taking all this into account Marx pointed out: "The intensity and vitality of all revolutions since 1789 can be gauged pretty accurately by their attitude to Poland. Poland is their 'external' thermometer."*** It follows that the Polish question became the focal point, a concentrated expression of the attitude of diverse social classes to the basic issues of bourgeois democracy. The attitude to the Polish national movement, which in those days was spearheaded against European reaction under the conditions of the already deep-seated antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in Germany, was an objective test of the alignment of classes in the struggle of the West European proletariat for a complete democratic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe, and of Germany in the first place. The Polish question also exposed the conciliatory nature of the German bourgeoisie in 1848.

After the 1848 German revolution had been defeated and Bismarck had completed the national unification of Germany along reformist lines, the Polish nobility, under the influence of the agrarian movement of the peasantry and the class struggle of the West European proletariat, drew close to the Russian

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, Berlin, 1969, S. 527.

** V. I. Lenin, "The National Question in Our Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 458.

*** Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975, p. 89.

autocracy politically. Engels wrote in this connection: "The nobility could neither maintain nor regain Polish independence; today, to the bourgeoisie, this independence is, to say the least, immaterial. Nevertheless, it is a necessity for the harmonious collaboration of the European nations. It can be gained only by the young Polish proletariat, and in its hands it is secure. For the workers of all the rest of Europe need the independence of Poland just as much as the Polish workers themselves." *

That accounted for the fact that when bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Europe had been completed in the main, the struggle for Poland's national independence was characterised by a totally different correlation of class forces; it pursued other tasks and became the direct cause of the Polish and the Russian proletariat. And when the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party tried to embellish their opportunist positions with Marx's statements on the Polish question in which he referred to the preceding, historically concrete situation, to a totally different stage of development of the class struggle both in Europe and in tsarist Russia, Lenin, expounding Marx's presentation of the Polish question, resolutely came out against their assertions. He vigorously fought against the influence of bourgeois nationalism and also against "left" doctrinairism. "The fact that it loses sight of the class point of view," he wrote, "obscures it by chauvinism and disrupts the unity of the present-day political struggle [of the proletariat — *R. U.*] ... prevents us from regarding the P. S. P. as a genuine Social-Democratic workers' party." **

Only a dialectic, i.e. a concrete historical, in the first place, and proletarian class, in the second place, presentation of the national question made Marx confident that he had adopted a correct stand towards the nationalists and anarchists of the various factions of the democratic movement in Europe at the time. As he fought against their influence upon the proletariat, Marx formulated the proletarian stand in the Polish, Irish and other questions.

Marx in one case supported a national movement, and in another opposed it; when doing so, he always took into

* Frederick Engels, Preface to the Polish Edition of 1892 of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, pp. 105-06.

** V. I. Lenin, "The National Question in Our Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 458.

account that the national question was subordinate to and dependent on the basic issue of the proletariat's class struggle for power. He made it clear that in this question a truly revolutionary workers' party should reckon with the interests of the proletarian struggle taking place in a specific historical situation and with a specific alignment and nature of the forces of the struggling classes.

Lenin who further elaborated the theory of the national question to adapt it to the new, imperialist epoch, wrote in this connection: "The several demands of democracy, including self-determination, are not an absolute, but only a *small part* of the general-democratic (now: general-socialist) *world* movement. In individual concrete cases, the part may contradict the whole; if so, it must be rejected."*

Marx has rendered a historical service not only because he substantiated the proletarian, dialectic solution of the national question in Europe of his day and subordinated the national question to the interests of the class struggle of the West European proletariat, disclosing the agrarian-peasant essence of the national movements, but also because on the example of Ireland and India he furnished a sample of the line which the proletariat of the oppressor nation should follow with regard to the revolutionary movement of an oppressed nation. Lenin's presentation of the national question in the epoch of imperialism, i.e. when the national question had developed from a local into a worldwide issue, rested fully on the views propounded by the founders of Marxism.

Marx and Engels held that the national oppression of Ireland was one of the sources of the political might of the reactionary English landed aristocracy, and that the English industrial and commercial bourgeoisie was interested in preserving Ireland as a supplier of cheap labour power and took advantage of the Irish question to foment national hostility between the working masses of England and Ireland. This greatly handicapped the development of the revolutionary struggle of the English working class against the English bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy. In a letter to Engels of December 10, 1869, Marx pointed out: "The English reaction in England had its roots ... in the subjugation of Ireland."**

* V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 341.

** Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 219.

In other letters he wrote: "After studying the Irish question for many years I have come to the conclusion that the decisive blow against the English ruling classes (and it will be decisive for the workers' movement all over the world) cannot be delivered *in England* but *only in Ireland*."* "The *primary condition* of emancipation here—the overthrow of the English landed oligarchy—remains impossible because its position here cannot be stormed so long as it maintains its strongly entrenched outposts in Ireland."** "What the Irish need is: 1) Self-government and independence from England. 2) An agrarian revolution."***

On top of that Marx believed that England's oppression of Ireland was also responsible for the former's reactionary foreign policy: her support for reactionary Russia and the struggle against revolutionary North America. "And not only does England's internal social development remain crippled by her present relations with Ireland; but also her foreign policy, and in particular her policy with regard to Russia and the United States of America,"**** he wrote.

By studying the Irish question and the developments in Poland Marx reached the general conclusion: "Any nation that oppresses another forges its own chains."*****

Marx and Engels advised the English working class unconditionally to support the national movement in Ireland. They regarded this as an essential prerequisite for a joint and successful struggle against the English bourgeoisie and landed aristocracy, inasmuch as the liberation of Ireland was the primary condition of the emancipation of the English working class itself, and the accelerated creation of prerequisites for the victory of the proletariat in England, owing to her domination of the world market, would have decisively influenced the entire class struggle of the continental proletariat. In this way Marx and Engels linked up the cause of Ireland's national liberation with the international prospects of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle.

That explained why opportunists in the Second International carefully concealed the views of Marx and Engels on the Irish

* Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 221.

** Ibid., pp. 216-17.

*** Ibid., p. 184.

**** Ibid., p. 217.

***** Karl Marx, "Confidential Communication", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1973, p. 176.

question, and that was why Lenin in the course of his struggle against opportunism in the Second International and against anti-Marxist trends in Russia repeatedly turned to these views and relied on them in his fight for a truly revolutionary interpretation of the "right of nations to self-determination" slogan.

A magnificent historical example of Marx's and Engels' proletarian strategy in the national question was their attitude to the Civil War in the USA, the Crimean War of 1853-1856, the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871 and the preceding Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

Marx vigorously supported the actions of the Black people in the South of the United States. That part of the country was the source of raw cotton for the English textile industry. The cheap raw material produced by slave labour was essential for the flourishing of Lancashire and its industrial monopoly on the world market. Acting in alliance with the English landed aristocracy, the English bourgeoisie was interested in the preservation of Black slavery in the United States. The foreign policy of England towards the USA was based on her support for the reactionary South against the revolutionary North. The bourgeoisie of the North waged an armed struggle against the reactionary slaveowners of the South. The situation brought about by the Civil War in the USA impeded the normal functioning of the English textile industry and deliveries of the raw materials to it. As a result there was a drop in sales and consequently a cut-back in production, which in turn increased unemployment in England, worsened the economic situation of her working class and led to hunger. The English bourgeoisie, acting in alliance with the landed aristocracy, repeatedly tried to shift the difficulties brought about by the situation on the shoulders of the English working class. Taking all these factors into account Marx formulated the attitude of the European and above all the English working class towards the Civil War in the USA and the armed struggle of the bourgeoisie of the North against the slaveowners of the South.

Views were current in the General Council of the First International that the solution of the Black national problem in the USA was strictly the business of the American bourgeoisie. Such a nihilistic attitude towards one of the most important historical events of the time, naturally, reflected the influence of the petty-bourgeois anarchism of Proudhon and Bakunin, on the one hand, and, on the other, was supported in one form or another by the trade union bureaucracy and the English work-

ing-class movement. Marx categorically opposed both deviations and spoke up in defence of the Black liberation movement and the North's revolutionary war against the South.

The General Council of the First International adopted Marx's stand. It called upon the European and English proletariat to struggle resolutely against the foreign policy of the English ruling classes which sided with the slaveowning South.

At the same time Marx insisted that it was essential consistently to fight against conciliatory trends displayed by North American democracy, and to bring the revolutionary struggle to a victorious conclusion. He also sought to impress upon the American sections of the First International that it was their class duty to counter the influence of bourgeois-nationalist ideology on the working people, Black people included, by suggesting that the Black workers should set up their own class organisation operating under the leadership of the proletariat. Marx's attitude to the Civil War in America is still a fine example of the tactic evolved by a proletarian revolutionary in the difficult conditions of a national-revolutionary movement, a tactic of an uncompromising and consistent struggle on two fronts.

His tactic during the Russo-Turkish War of 1853-1856 was just as important. The founders of Marxism foresaw the inevitable collapse of the Ottoman Empire which was disintegrating at an accelerated pace, on the one hand, under the impact of mass national movements in the Balkans, and on the other, under the influence of the colonial policy of the European powers in Asia Minor and in the north of Africa. They were fully aware of the terrible plight of the Balkan peoples suffering from age-long Turkish despotism. Nevertheless in the course of the Crimean War of 1853-1856 Marx and Engels expected that a European revolution and not Russian tsarism's military operations against Turkey would bring about the full liberation of the Balkan peoples from both the Ottoman yoke and Russia's reactionary policy.

Of great interest is Marx's and Engels' tactic during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. The objective content of this war was the dynastic struggle between the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns for Germany's national and state unification: in the first case, under Austrian rule, and in the second, under the rule of Prussian monarchistic camarilla. In Germany herself the working-class movement was politically divided into two hostile camps — the Lassalleans and the Eisenachers. The first was

headed by Lassalle and Schweitzer and the other, by Liebknecht and Bebel.

Lassalle and Schweitzer called upon the German working class to support the Prussia of the Hohenzollerns against the Austria of the Hapsburgs, while Bebel and Liebknecht, realising the need to fight against Bismarck's reactionary policy, supported Austria. Neither side took into account the independent political position of the German working class and its interests. It was only Marx and Engels who, in keeping with the dialectic presentation of the national question, urged the German working class to take advantage of the military and political crisis in Austria and Prussia and bring about a revolutionary unification of Germany and the social and political emancipation of the entire German working class.

In general form Marx's and Engels' stand contained the basic principles of the tactic which Lenin developed and raised to a higher level in a different historical situation. He advanced the slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war and thus bringing about the defeat of the national bourgeoisie.

Even more brilliant in terms of its historical significance, political expediency and class content was the tactic which the founders of scientific communism and the First International they led effected throughout the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871 right up to the Paris Commune. They regarded it as a defensive war as far as Germany was concerned and a reactionary one for Bonapartist France. During its first stage, prior to the defeat of the French at Sedan, they thought that Germany's victory in the war would help its unification as a national state; this would have contributed to the development of a broad class struggle of the German proletariat against the German bourgeoisie. As a result the German proletariat would gain a preponderance in the European working-class movement thus enabling revolutionary Marxism to get the best of petty-bourgeois Proudhonism and its epigones in France. In these concrete historical conditions Marx, Engels and the General Council of the First International repeatedly orientated the European working class on striking the main blow at Bonapartist France.

Here, too, the revolutionary unity and solidarity of the European—German, French and English—proletariat were to play their role as an instrument of routing Bonapartist reaction in Europe which was strangling the French working class and endeavouring to perpetuate Germany's territorial fragmentation and at the same time to stamp out the revolutionary

movement of the German working class. As they urged the proletariat to concentrate its main forces for a decisive blow at the Napoleonic monarchy, Marx and Engels insisted that the German working class and its leaders should resolutely fight against all the annexationist plans of the Prussian bourgeoisie and landowners who among other things were inspired by the secret alliance between Bismarck's Prussia and tsarist Russia. Therefore in the initial period of the war it was the international duty of the German proletariat to join forces with the French and the European working class as a whole and to deal a devastating blow at the Bonapartist reaction, on the one hand, and to fight steadfastly against the Prussian bourgeoisie and landowners who sought the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine, on the other.

The situation, however, changed radically after the rout of the French army, the surrender of Napoleon III to the Prussians at Sedan and the establishment of the Third Republic in France. The new historical situation compelled the European proletariat to adopt a new tactic. Now Marx and Engels considered that the main blow had to be delivered at Bismarck and his annexationist policy. They also decided upon the tactic of supporting the French Republic and demanded that the English working class should lead the political struggle against the domestic bourgeoisie in order to force it to recognise the new, republican France. And while now it was the internationalist task of the German proletariat to fight resolutely and thwart the plans of the Prussian bourgeoisie and landowners who sought to annex Alsace and Lorraine from France, the task of the French working-class movement, according to Marx and Engels, was to organise itself on a mass scale politically on the basis of the programme and tactics of the First International. Thus, in the second period of the war Marx and Engels also subordinated their tactic to the interests of the proletariat in order to strengthen the joint struggle of the entire European working class against the entire European bourgeoisie.

The uprising of the Paris workers and the establishment of the Commune which led to the formation of a centre of proletarian dictatorship and of the Commune's struggle against the ruling classes of all the European nations, created a hitherto unprecedented historical situation.

Marx and Engels, and the First International which they headed, called upon all the proletarians and working people of the world to struggle against Thiers' republic, against Bismarck's

government and against all the ruling classes and the policies of their governments, to promote international solidarity and support the Commune in every way. Thus, during the Franco-Prussian War the founders of scientific communism employed very flexible and manoeuvrable tactics depending on the changing historical conditions; and the tactical course of the First International and its founders was invariably designed to further the class interests of the proletariat.

The leaders of the Second International took great pains to conceal Marx's and Engels' views on the connection between opportunism in the working-class movement and the imperialist features of English capitalism whose world colonial monopoly was based on the oppression of Ireland, India, China and Egypt. This extremely profound link which Lenin subsequently disclosed to the full is mentioned in the correspondence between Marx and Engels long before the advent of the imperialist stage in the development of capitalism. Back in 1858 Engels wrote to Marx: "The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat *alongside* the bourgeoisie. For a nation which exploits the whole world this is of course to a certain extent justifiable."*

Incidentally, the leaders of the Second International manifested their rejection of revolutionary Marxism by systematically ignoring this feature of English capitalism (emergence of a workers' aristocracy) which Engels had spotted and which with time became a basic feature of world imperialism and a bulwark of the political influence of social-democratic parties in Germany, France, the Netherlands and other imperialist countries. Hence views expressed in the Second International such as those which van Kol set forth in his report on the colonial question at the Amsterdam Congress in 1904 when he declared that Marx's theory of the collapse of capitalism was untenable.

Sharply critical of van Kol's statement, Lenin wrote: "The whole report was saturated with a spirit, not of proletarian class struggle, but of the most petty-bourgeois—and even worse, bureaucratic—peddling of 'reforms'."**

* Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 103.

** V.I. Lenin, "Meeting of the International Socialist Bureau", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 245.

And when at the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International in 1907 van Kol's stand was reflected in the proposed resolution, Lenin characterised the draft as a "decisive step towards subordinating the proletariat to bourgeois ideology, to bourgeois imperialism, which is now arrogantly raising its head".*

Prior to the First World War the leaders of the Second International and the German Social-Democratic Party openly defended the imperialist colonisation policy. A resolution was submitted at a congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in 1911 which recognised the need "for a proportionate distribution of foreign spheres of influence in keeping with their economic importance and the requirements of the states possessing them".

The parties of the Second International reduced the Marxist interpretation of the principle of self-determination of nations to the right to so-called autonomy, and the principle of self-determination of nations up to secession and the formation of independent states, merely to the right of the oppressed nations to cultural autonomy.

The social-imperialism of the Second International was moving in to replace revolutionary Marxism, and only the Bolsheviks led by Lenin defended it against the opportunists who had turned into apologists of the imperialist domination of the colonies. But Lenin did not confine himself solely to upholding the Marxist stand on the national question. He further elaborated and elevated to a new height the Marxist theory on the national-colonial question.

An immense theoretical importance still attaches to Marx's and Engels' views about China and India, about their economic system and historical development, the role that was played by the penetration of foreign capital into these countries and their agrarian systems, about the consequences of the domination of foreign capital, the prospects of a revolution in the East and the connection between the anti-colonial movements in that part of the world and revolutionary movements in the West. Marx concerned himself with all the details of the Tai-Ping rebellion in China and the Indian Mutiny. To this day his statements on the colonial issues are guidelines in the theoretical activity of the international communist movement. Some of the views expressed by Marx and Engels about China and India were in the nature

* V. I. Lenin, "The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 76.

of a prognosis. Referring to the approaching crisis of overproduction in Europe and the uprisings in China, for example, Marx said: "Now that England has become the cause of a revolution in China the question arises: what will be the subsequent impact of this revolution on England, and through England on Europe. It is not difficult to answer it.... It can be safely predicted that the Chinese revolution will cast a spark that will ignite the primed mine of the modern industrial system and set off the long-maturing general crisis which after it spreads abroad will be followed by political revolutions on the continent." *

Marx also made the famous prediction that the fleets of Western powers would enter the Chinese waters in order to crush the revolution. "It would be an interesting sight: China causes upheavals in the Western world and at the same time the Western powers with the help of British, French and American naval ships are restoring 'order' in Shanghai, Nanking and in the mouth of the Great Canal." **

Referring to the penetration of English capital into China and the construction of railways there with the view to exploiting the colonial market, Engels wrote: "Chinese railways mean the destruction of the entire foundation of small-scale Chinese agriculture and domestic industry; and since there will even be no counterpoise in the form of large-scale Chinese industry, hundreds of millions of the population will find themselves in conditions making their life impossible." ***

The manner in which the imperialists exercised their rule in the colonies fully confirmed this forecast.

And yet we still come across a Populist presentation of the colonial question which, in effect, denies the development of capitalism in these countries. It is, therefore, necessary to recall what Marx said about the inevitable consequences of the British rule in India: "England has to fulfil a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating — the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia." **** This, of course, did not prevent Marx from stating with the utmost clarity that "the his-

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 9, Berlin, 1969, S. 97, 98, 100.

** Ibid., S. 100.

*** Ibid., Bd. 38, Berlin, 1968, S. 469-70.

**** Karl Marx, "The Future Results of British Rule in India", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 494.

toric pages of their rule in India report hardly anything beyond that destruction. The work of regeneration hardly transpires through a heap of ruins. Nevertheless it has begun.”*

To this day Marx’s articles on India show Marxists-Leninists how to fight on two fronts: against those who are inclined to assess the role and the consequences of colonial aggression from pro-imperialist positions and laud its “civilising” role, and against those who are oblivious of the fact that by subjugating India, China and other Asian countries imperialism created its own gravedigger in the person of a broad front of national forces. Having taken shape as a result of the economic and political development which the colonialists willy-nilly helped to promote, this front in alliance with the revolutionary movement of the working class in the industrialised capitalist countries can sever the imperialist yoke and put an end to colonialism for all time.

Marx’s idea of coupling the proletarian revolution in the West with national liberation movements and wars in the East was right for his epoch. He laid the foundation for this key problem. Lenin enlarged upon this idea and raised it to the level of new tasks in the world class struggle of the proletariat, in a period when “as a result of the last imperialist war, a number of countries of the East, India, China, etc., have been completely jolted out of the rut”, when “their development has definitely shifted to general European capitalist lines” and the East “has been definitely drawn into the general maelstrom of the world revolutionary movement”.**

Lenin noticed that the peoples of the East had started to awaken to active political life long before the imperialist war. “World capitalism and the 1905 movement in Russia have finally aroused Asia.”*** Later, in connection with the October Socialist Revolution and the formation of a new centre of the world working-class movement to which all truly revolutionary national movements gravitated, Lenin wrote: “The imperialist war aroused the East also and drew its peoples into international politics.... The period of the awakening of the East in the

* Karl Marx, “The Future Results of British Rule in India”, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 495.

** V.I. Lenin, “Better Fewer, But Better”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 499.

*** V.I. Lenin, “The Awakening of Asia”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 86.

contemporary revolution is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world, so as not to be simply objects of the enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, the need for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind.” *

This idea of combining the proletarian revolution in Europe with the colonial revolution in Asia was first advanced by Marx in 1853 with respect to India. “The Indians,” he wrote, “will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindoos themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether.” **

In 1882 Engels wrote to Karl Kautsky: “In my opinion the colonies proper, i. e. the countries occupied by a European population — Canada, the Cape, Australia — will all become independent; on the other hand, the countries inhabited by a native population, which are simply subjugated — India, Algeria, the Dutch, Portuguese and Spanish possessions — must be taken over for the time being by the proletariat and led as rapidly as possible towards independence. How this process will develop is difficult to say. India will perhaps, indeed very probably, make a revolution, and as a proletariat in process of self-emancipation cannot conduct any colonial wars, India would have to be given a free hand; things would, of course, not pass off without all sorts of destruction, but that sort of thing is inseparable from all revolutions.... One thing alone is certain: the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing.” ***

All that Marx and Engels had said about China and India shows that they regarded the colonial problem in the system of capitalism as an additional factor that exacerbated capitalism’s internal and external contradictions. In this connection their views on the role played by the colonies during the crisis are

* V. I. Lenin. “Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 160.

** Karl Marx, “The Future Results of British Rule in India”, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 498.

*** K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 331.

most interesting. In October 1858 Engels, who carefully followed the development of the colonial economy in view of the impending economic crisis on the European continent and also from the point of view of the new prospects it inevitably opened before the class struggle of the proletariat, made the following observation: "All this looks deucedly optimistic and the devil alone knows how long it will last, if there will not be considerable overproduction with an eye to India and China.... It seems to me that India and China ... will be the immediate cause of overproduction." *

As conditions for another cyclical crisis of 1869 continued to ripen, Engels expressed the following thought in a letter to Marx: "China, whose market is gradually expanding, can evidently once again save the cotton industry, at least for the time being." **

Marx and Engels also examined the question of colonies from the point of view of the impact of their economic and political situation on the aggravation of the capitalist crises.

These thoughts of the founders of Marxism are most topical today. The revolutionary significance of the factors tending to exacerbate capitalist crises should not be underestimated in our epoch, for they constitute a tremendous force which undermines the imperialist system. Once a reserve of capitalism, the former colonies are now its opponents and a reserve of the socialist revolution.

The young independent states act as a catalyst of imperialism's economic crisis, and not simply as a passive and exploited appendage of the world capitalist economy, but as a conscious and active fighter against the onerous terms of the economic exchange fully determined to put an end to capitalism's policy of shifting the burden of its economic difficulties onto the shoulders of the oppressed peoples. The concerted actions of the liberated countries at the time of the oil crisis demonstrated the new role which countries that produce raw materials can play and will continue to play in the world capitalist economy in the period of the collapse of the colonial system.

* * *

Lenin saved Marx's and Engels' theoretical principles for

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 29, Berlin, 1969, S. 537.

** Ibid., S. 411.

solving the national-colonial question from revision by European social-reformists. He enriched and adapted them to new conditions on the basis of the vast revolutionary experience of the working class and national liberation movement. Lenin carried on his revolutionary activity in a different historical situation — in the epoch of imperialism.

By the beginning of the 20th century the imperialist powers had completed the territorial division of the world among themselves. The monopolies derived colossal profits—up to \$ 2,000 million annually in the year preceding the First World War, and up to \$ 4,000 million on the eve of the Second World War—from the export of capital and ruthless exploitation of the downtrodden colonial population. The peoples of the East were exploited by a handful of states which impeded the progress of the whole of humanity. The replacement of pre-monopoly capitalism by imperialist capitalism strengthened reaction and national oppression, and colonial plunder became even more widespread.

The unprecedented scale of socialisation of production, concentration and centralisation of capital, the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, the shift from free competition to monopoly domination, the internationalisation of economic links and capital all meant that “private economic and private property relations constitute a shell which no longer fits its contents, a shell which must inevitably decay if its removal is artificially delayed”.*

By developing and completing the process of the creation of the material prerequisites of socialism, imperialism not only does not remove the main contradictions of the capitalist mode of production—between the social nature of labour and the private capitalist method of appropriating the results of this labour, between the tendency of the productive forces towards limitless expansion and the totality of property relations fettering their growth—but also exacerbates them to such an extent that the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and landowners throughout the world has become an urgent task. Finance capital amasses superprofits by enslaving the bulk of humanity and subjugating small peasant producers in all parts of the world with the help of various economic and non-economic methods. “Capitalism,

* V. I. Lenin, “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 303.

which began its development with petty usury capital, is ending its development with gigantic usury capital.” *

Referring to the consequences of the domination of finance capital in the imperialist countries Lenin wrote: “In one way or another, nearly the whole of the rest of the world is more or less the debtor to and tributary of these international banker countries....” ** The export of capital has become a typical form of the exploitation of the backward countries. The domination of finance capital and the export of capital, those typical features of the new epoch, brought about the final division of the world and the emergence of the problem of having it repartitioned. “Capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of ‘advanced’ countries.” *** The job of completing the division of the world and then its redivision was tackled by international monopoly associations, these “supermonopolies” which arose on the basis of a new stage of world concentration of capital and production, incomparably higher than the preceding stages. **** “Hence, we are living in a peculiar epoch of world colonial policy, which is most closely connected with the ‘latest stage in the development of capitalism’, with finance capital.” *****

The colonial policy of the imperialist epoch, however, was not confined to the division of backward countries and a fresh repartitioning of the colonial periphery. “Finance capital,” wrote Lenin, “is such a great, such a decisive, you might say, force in all economic and in all international relations, that it is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject, to itself even states enjoying the fullest political independence....” *****

The difference between the colonial policy of the epoch of imperialism and the policy of colonial seizures in the epoch of primary accumulation and then in the epoch of industrial capital, is just as great as the difference between the economy of monopoly capitalism and the economy of capitalism of free competition, or the policy of commercial and usurious monop-

* V. I. Lenin, “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 233.

** Ibid., p. 240.

*** Ibid., p. 191.

**** Ibid., p. 246.

***** Ibid., p. 254.

***** Ibid., p. 259.

olies of the epoch of primary capitalist accumulation. "Even the capitalist colonial policy of *previous* stages of capitalism is essentially different from the colonial policy of finance capital." *

Working in a new historical situation and basing himself on Marx's and Engels' theoretical propositions, Lenin evolved the proletarian teaching about the unity of the national-colonial revolutions with the world proletarian revolution, and linked up the solution of the national-colonial question with the overthrow of imperialism. He not only resurrected the class, concrete historical presentation of the national question made by the founders of scientific socialism and then relegated to oblivion by the leaders of the Second International but also showed the worldwide scale and significance of the national question.

Lenin expounded the thought that the solution of the national question in the imperialist epoch was one of the most important tasks of the socialist revolution. Strategically and tactically his works provide an answer to the vital question of how to win over the peasantry of all the oppressed peoples to the side of the proletariat and draw it into the anti-imperialist struggle. The idea of an alliance between the world proletariat and world colonial peasantry advanced by Marx and Engels was brilliantly elaborated by Lenin in his polemic against right-wing opportunists from the Second International and left-wing doctrinarians. The first proclaimed an era of "super-imperialism", while the second, an era of "pure" imperialism and, therefore, of a "pure" socialist revolution, without realising that the socialist revolution would become an epoch combining both proletarian revolutions in the advanced countries and bourgeois-democratic national liberation revolutions and wars in the backward and oppressed countries. That accounts for the fact that while continuing to wage an unrelenting struggle against social-imperialism in the Second International Lenin resolutely opposed the left in the German Social-Democratic Party (Rosa Luxemburg and others) and their adherents in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party who repudiated the revolutionary significance of national liberation movements in the epoch of imperialism and sought to replace the extremely complicated historical process of the overthrow of imperialism in the industrial countries and in the colonies by the confused

* Ibid., p. 260.

and politically harmful thesis that self-determination was impossible under capitalism and unnecessary under socialism.

The theory of "pure" imperialism, that prototype of "organised capitalism", ignored the inevitability of national wars, did not regard them as revolutionary and rejected the need for the revolutionary proletariat to form an alliance with them in the interests of the worldwide struggle against imperialism. This theory, which undermined the united front of the proletarian revolution and the national liberation movement, naturally, severed all links with Marx's theoretical principles and his methodology by countering the Marxist-Leninist plan for solving the national-colonial question in the imperialist epoch in indissoluble connection with the proletarian revolution in the West, with an anti-Marxist and metaphysical scheme of a "pure" socialist revolution. And, of course, there was not even a hint in this theory at a concrete historical, dialectic and proletarian class approach to the national question.

Lenin studied and generalised the experience of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East which developed parallel to the growth of capitalism in these countries and under the impact of the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907. He showed that it roused the Asian peoples to political activity. The revolution in Russia was followed by revolutions in Turkey, Iran, China and by an upsurge of the national liberation struggle in India and Java. Linking the struggle of the peoples of the East with the tasks of the socialist revolution, Lenin emphasised that the liberation struggle of the peoples of awakened Asia was a key component of the proletariat's struggle against imperialism. "The awakening of Asia and the beginning of the struggle for power by the advanced proletariat of Europe are a symbol of the new phase in world history that began early this century,"* he wrote.

Indeed, the 20th century became a century of socialist and national liberation revolutions. The Revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia, the first people's revolution of the imperialist epoch, was a prologue to the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution that ushered in a new era in the revolutionary remaking of the world. The revolutions in Asia which followed the 1905 Revolution in Russia likewise greatly stimulated the development of the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples in Asian countries.

* V. I. Lenin, "The Awakening of Asia", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 86.

Lenin searchingly analysed the correlation of class forces in this first round of the revolutions in Asia. He held that the working masses in town and country were the main motive force of the national liberation revolutions. The development of the national liberation movements in the period following the October Socialist Revolution fully confirmed his premise about the decisive role of the masses in the revolutions in the countries of the East.

Lenin paid special attention to every manifestation of initiative and independent action of the proletariat in the colonies, to the growth of its role in the revolution. "In India, too, the proletariat has already developed to conscious political mass struggle,"* he wrote referring to the mass strike in Bombay in 1908.

He repeatedly warned that the role played by the bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries where the monopoly bourgeoisie was reactionary, should not be confused with the role played by the national bourgeoisie in the colonies and dependencies where the bourgeoisie had not yet exhausted its revolutionary potential.

In the struggle for democratic freedoms in which huge masses played a most active part, the proletariat of the colonies gradually became aware of the historic mission it had to perform. Lenin's ideas about the vast significance of the struggle for general democratic rights became a component part of the propositions concerning the democratic stage of the national liberation revolutions. The entire course of the anti-imperialist struggle waged by the peoples of the East confirms the validity of Lenin's ideas.

Lenin discovered and substantiated the law of the uneven economic and political development of countries under imperialism and showed that in the already partitioned world the profound contradictions between the imperialist powers were fraught with acute conflicts and world wars which weakened each of the warring sides. All this created conditions for sundering the chain of imperialism where its link was the weakest, and making the victory of socialism possible at first in a small number of capitalist countries, or even only in one of them.

In the face of the approaching general crisis of capitalism on the eve of the First World War and the threat of a clash

* V. I. Lenin, "Inflammable Material in World Politics", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 184.

between the imperialists who sought to repartition the world, it was necessary to strengthen the world proletariat ideologically in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, and mobilise it for a struggle against the colonialist aspirations of the imperialist governments and against the revisionist views of opportunists of all hues on the national-colonial question.

Lenin exposed the efforts of the national-opportunists to blunt the vigilance of the toiling masses with discourses on "national unity", "common national culture" and "national-cultural autonomy". All these opportunistic "theories" were designed to bring the proletariat under the influence of bourgeois ideology. Lenin wrote that it was most important for the socialists in the metropolitan countries resolutely to safeguard the right of nations to self-determination up to secession; it was up to the socialists and proletarians in the colonies and dependencies to fight for the fraternity and unity of the workers and the working people of all nationalities against the bourgeoisie's nationalist tendencies.

He said that it was necessary to support the patriotic aspirations of the masses in the oppressed countries in every way and at the same time make no ideological concessions to national-chauvinism to the detriment of internationalism. "The fatherland," he wrote, "i.e., the given political, cultural and social environment, is a most powerful factor in the class struggle of the proletariat.... The proletariat cannot be indifferent to the political, social and cultural conditions of its struggle; consequently it cannot be indifferent to the destinies of its country. But the destinies of the country interest it only *to the extent* that they affect its class struggle, and not in virtue of some bourgeois 'patriotism', quite indecent on the lips of a Social-Democrat."*

Lenin always demanded that the progressive national liberation movements should soberly assess their role and place in the world revolutionary process whose focal point after the victory of the October Socialist Revolution became the struggle between the forces of socialism and imperialism. "In the present world situation following the imperialist war, reciprocal relations between peoples and the world political system as a whole are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. Unless we bear that in mind, we

* V. I. Lenin, "Bellicose Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, pp. 194-95.

shall not be able to pose a single national or colonial problem correctly, even if it concerns a most outlying part of the world.”*

He defended the revolutionary significance of the slogan of the self-determination of nations against all attacks by opportunists, but never fetishised this slogan and the national movements themselves or turned them into an absolute; he warned the Party that national movements, which were objectively designed to strengthen imperialism, and not to weaken it, were not only possible but also inevitable. He held that it was absolutely necessary to fight against those national movements which were used by this or that imperialist power as an instrument to further its reactionary policy.

Examining the internal motive forces of the national movements and defining the tasks of the proletarian party in the struggle on two fronts, Lenin said that it was imperative, first, precisely to determine “the interests of the oppressed classes, of working and exploited people, and the general concept of national interests as a whole, which implies the interests of the ruling class”; second, “to give special support to the peasant movement against the landowners, against landed proprietorship, and against all manifestations or survivals of feudalism”; third, to support the national liberation movement in the colonies and form a temporary alliance “with bourgeois democracy in the backward countries”, always remembering that it was essential “under all circumstances” to “uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its most embryonic form”, and to imbue the colonial working class with an awareness of their special tasks in the struggle.

Lenin’s tenets formed the foundation for the tactics of the international communist movement and prompted it undeviatingly to support anti-imperialist movements and draw closer to the progressive forces of the oppressed peoples. These processes became particularly active after the Second World War, under the new international conditions resulting from the rout of fascism and Japanese militarism, in which a decisive role was played by the Soviet Union, and the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

The shift in the correlation of world forces, caused by the formation of the world system of socialism and the collapse of im-

* V. I. Lenin, “The Second Congress of the Communist International”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 241.

perialism's colonial monopoly in the countries of the East, created favourable conditions for the rise and development of victorious national liberation movements.

Postwar development is distinguished by the fact that the socialist ideas gripped the minds of hundreds of millions of people living in non-socialist countries. Even in those Eastern countries which won national independence not under the guidance of the working class, leading political parties and politicians say that they want to form a society patterned along socialist lines, though their concept of socialism naturally differs considerably from a Marxist one. A feature of the development of the liberated countries of the East is that political parties and politicians who overtly or covertly champion colonialism and endeavour to thwart national revival and social reforms are increasingly falling into isolation and losing the support of the masses they had once enjoyed.

As they take stock of world and domestic events tens of millions of people in the newly-independent countries of the East are gradually but inevitably becoming aware of the advantages of the socialist path of development. Great difficulties still face the countries liberated from the colonial yoke in their struggle for economic independence. But the growth of national and class self-awareness of the bulk of the people and the increasing influence of the working class and its organisations undermine the influence of the neocolonialists, isolate their adherents on the local scene and create conditions for major social changes. The adoption of the socialist orientation and the non-capitalist road of development by a whole group of Afro-Asian countries at a time when the socialist community is turning into a decisive factor of world historic process brilliantly confirms the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist thesis about the alliance between socialism and the national liberation movement.

The peoples of the former colonies, as Lenin had predicted, are coming to play an historical role in the international struggle for peace, freedom, democracy and socialism. The last strongholds of the once mighty colonial empires are crumbling and the irreversible political, economic, cultural and spiritual decolonisation is proceeding apace. The liberated peoples are uniting in order to hold their ground against the political domination of the imperialist powers and their covert methods of neocolonial economic exploitation. In the former colonies more and more people are becoming the

conscious enemies of capitalism, and the alliance of the foremost political movements and parties with the socialist community is strengthening. All this attests not only to the profundity of the Marxist-Leninist analysis and the power of scientific prognostication, but also to the great revolutionary role played by the practical implementation by the international working class and communist movement of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the national-colonial question.

The Political Line of the Marxists-Leninists in the National Liberation Struggle of the Peoples of the East

The main directions of the communist strategy and tactics with regard to the colonial, semicolonial and dependent countries of the East which were either oppressed or controlled by imperialism, were worked out by Lenin and designed to cover the entire historical period of transition to socialism on a world scale. He formulated and presented relevant conclusions concerning this problem as he studied and ascertained the objective laws of human development, created an all-embracing theory of the world revolutionary process and elaborated the principles of Party leadership of the revolutionary struggle of the masses in the 20th century.

Lenin has rendered a great service to humanity by his all-round development and enrichment of the Marxist theory. It became the foundation for the elaboration and implementation of the proletariat's strategy and tactics and its political line, which enables the Party of the working class effectively to influence the law-governed historic process of the change of the social system. As regards the laws governing this process, they are theoretically expounded by scientific socialism.

The proletarian revolution in Russia showed that Lenin's principles of guiding the revolutionary struggle were most effective. Some of the basic features of the Great October Socialist Revolution were, as Lenin said, of international significance, primarily in the sense that their recurrence on a world scale was inevitable. Such features undoubtedly are the basic principles of

guiding the revolutionary struggle of the masses which have proved their effectivity both in the Great October Revolution and in the revolutions which took place later in other countries. As distinct from the concrete strategic and tactical conclusions which a Marxist-Leninist party may draw under specific conditions and in a definite period, these principles are of universal significance because they had been formulated on the basis of a profound class analysis. "Only an objective consideration of the sum total of the relations between absolutely all the classes in a given society, and consequently a consideration of the objective stage of development reached by that society and of the relations between it and other societies, can serve as a basis for the correct tactics of an advanced class. At the same time, all classes and all countries are regarded, not statically, but dynamically, i.e., not in a state of immobility, but in motion (whose laws are determined by the economic conditions of existence of each class)." *

Lenin evolved his teaching on the national and the national-colonial question as a component part of the theory of the revolutionary transformation of the colonial world through two consecutive stages—the stage of the democratic, national liberation revolution, and the stage of the socialist revolution. He envisaged that, in keeping with the laws of historical development, the first stage would grow into the second and that this would occur in various forms and take different periods of time. Therefore, in formulating the corresponding strategic and tactical propositions he took into account the socio-economic and political situation in the countries of the East. In this respect these propositions were an expression of Leninism's general strategic and tactical principles adapted to the specific conditions in the Eastern countries. Lenin could not and did not regard the national-colonial question as an independent issue either from the theoretical or strategic point of view. He approached it from the standpoint of the class struggle of the proletariat, which was fulfilling its world historic mission, that of liberating man from all forms of exploitation and oppression, and of the principles of proletarian internationalism. At the same time the fact that history has fully confirmed the correctness of Lenin's analysis of the specific forms and roads of the development of the countries of the East which was made on the basis of scientific socialism, convincingly

* V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 75.

attests to the universal nature of the basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist teaching.

As long ago as the first decade of the 20th century Lenin proved that the peoples of the East were an active force which could strike and was striking a blow at the imperialist system from its "colonial flank". And when the struggle in Western Europe for the establishment of national states (Germany and Italy) ended in their formation and the national question was in the main resolved within the bourgeois-democratic framework, the focal point in the struggle to resolve the national question shifted to the East, primarily to the Asian continent. The foreign imperialist oppression which "superimposed" upon traditional oppression that usually took the form of domination of Asian despoties and their feudal epigones, encountered a steadily mounting resistance. At that time the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia (in countries where they had come into existence and took shape) became the vehicles of national self-awareness and very gradually, not without timidity, turned for assistance to the toiling masses, to their strength and hatred for the foreigners. Anti-imperialist nationalism was gathering strength. It was the political expression of the bourgeoisie's interests. At the same time, ever new sections of the population which followed the bourgeoisie became involved in a political struggle for the first time. It should be borne in mind that only the participation in this struggle, initially under the guidance of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois strata, opened for them the road to future independent actions.

If in the East the interests of the local bourgeoisie, its ideologues and politicians were just as closely connected with the interests of imperialism as were the interests of the bourgeoisie and the autocracy in Russia, the gravitation of the masses towards bourgeois anti-imperialist nationalism would naturally have been a negative phenomenon. But it should be emphasised here that the basic features of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia differed very substantially from those of the national liberation revolutions in the East.

The Russian bourgeoisie had on the whole reconciled itself to the despotism of the autocracy and had come to terms with it. With its help it was able to pursue an imperialist policy and jointly with foreign capital bring about the increasing bourgeoisification of the autocracy and the social system, with the aim of furthering its economic, i.e. basic interests. Nothing of the sort existed in the relations between the imperialist bourgeoisie of

the metropolitan countries and the nascent and developing bourgeoisie in the colonies and semicolonies. In the East even those circles of the national bourgeoisie which were inclined to come to terms with imperialism were aware that such a policy, if applied as a principle, would continuously strike at their own fundamental interests. The fact that the national bourgeoisie vacillated between opposition to imperialism and a temporary deal with it, did not weaken the antagonism of this contradiction.

Finally, in addition to the revolutionary bourgeoisie there was also a developing petty-bourgeois democracy in the East which was opposed to imperialism and capable of carrying out radical transformations. Its social base consisted of broad strata, ranging from the middle and upper sections of the peasantry to the entrepreneur bourgeoisie, all of which were the vehicles of commodity-money relations. It should not be overlooked that foreign imperialist domination coupled with the occupation and plunder of a country implied also national or racial discrimination of the local population and naturally evoked deadly hatred on the part of the broad sections of the population of the Eastern countries where national self-awareness was beginning to develop. It follows that the involvement of the working people, including workers, in anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist nationalism, in national liberation movement which expressed first of all the class interests of the local bourgeoisie, was a historically justified phenomenon, though it inhibited the growth of class self-awareness among the working people.

The essential features of the bourgeois-democratic movement in Asian colonies and semicolonies which distinguished it from the bourgeois-democratic movement in Russia found their expression during revolutionary upheavals, a time when the nature and the correlation of class forces become fully manifest. Of course, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the West and in the East had a common basic social content — its objective task was to abolish pre-capitalist social relations. But the nature and the correlation of class forces in the East were greatly influenced by the anti-imperialist and revolutionary potentialities of the bourgeois classes, something which the bourgeoisie in the West and in Russia lacked; in the West they were expended in the course of revolutions “from above” and “from below”, while the Russian bourgeoisie always feared a revolution more than the autocracy. That was why the bour-

geois-democratic revolution in the East could develop through a general national stage in the imperialist epoch. In this sense the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the East, which was under imperialist bondage, resembled bourgeois revolutions of the past, all the more so since some of them had a national liberation character. And just like these revolutions, the liberation movements in the East expressed the economic need to set up independent national states. It would be wrong merely to state that the 1905 and the February 1917 revolutions in Russia, on the one hand, and the revolutions in the colonies and semicolonies, on the other, were bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the epoch of imperialism. The fact of the matter is that the entry of capitalism into its highest and last stage, the stage of imperialism, did not bring about the elimination of the formerly existing structures. The countries of the East which had become a part of the world imperialist system continued to live in the "pre-capitalist times" to a much greater extent than Russia. The bourgeoisie which emerged in them was confronted with an economically justified task of winning state independence.

Looking ahead it should be noted that, precisely because bourgeois democracy in the East could solve its own democratic tasks, the Communists and representatives of the working class formed and under specific conditions continue to form alliances with it, correctly assuming that these tasks could be fulfilled on the basis of an alliance with the peasantry and the anti-imperialist bourgeoisie.

It would be wrong to speak either about "similarity" or "dissimilarity" of bourgeois-democratic and national liberation revolutions in different epochs and countries without taking into consideration some very important specific features. The rise of the imperialist system with the centre dominating the periphery (metropolitan country-colony) as its fundamental principle was in itself a sign of the appearance of a new epoch: humanity found itself involved in a single economic and sociopolitical complex and became a part of the mechanism of world capitalist economy integrated on the basis of exploitation and consequently torn by class, national and inter-imperialist contradictions. At the same time the socialisation of production in the more advanced countries ("centre") attained such a high level that the basis of society in them became fully ripe for a socialist revolution. As a result from an historical point of view the entire system became the threshold of the socialist transformation of society. The "periphery", however, remained

in the preceding epoch or even in the one before, in the sense that there, as in the past, particularly in the agrarian system (and these were almost exclusively agrarian countries), the surviving forms of pre-capitalist relations (or early capitalist forms of accumulation) prevailed which imperialism sought to preserve, and that only elementary national-democratic reforms had been placed on the order of the day.

And yet the colonial "periphery" lived both in the past and in the new epoch not only because it was an exploited part of the world imperialist system, but also because following its inclusion into this system the capitalist enclaves in it began steadily to expand. This took place as a result of the direct invasion of foreign monopoly capital and the spontaneous growth of local industrial capital on the basis of the development of commodity-money relations into capitalist relations and the formation of a domestic consumer, production and labour market. Alongside hired labour employed by foreign and local capitalists in the towns, diverse forms of metayage typical of the long period of transition to capitalism existed in the countryside with people working for the landlords, usurers and middlemen traders. As a result they formed a steadily increasing army of hired labour, the village poor, the artisan pre-proletariat and hundreds of millions of paupers. Such were the extremely difficult conditions under which these countries were advancing towards bourgeois-democratic transformations, a road which had already been traversed in the West.

In the 1920s and 1930s mass proletarian contingents appeared in the more advanced Eastern countries and the bourgeoisie there became more and more prone to vacillations and conciliatory policy. The victory of the October Revolution in Russia created an objective opportunity for the revolution in the East to transcend the boundaries of its democratic framework. The historical reason for the success of national liberation revolutions in a number of countries was that, prior to the Second World War or immediately after the Soviet Union and the anti-Hitler coalition had routed German fascism and Japanese militarism, the conditions were created enabling their Communist parties to play a leading role. It was also confirmed that revolutionary democracy, too, particularly if it acted in alliance with Marxists-Leninists, could make the revolution go beyond its democratic limits and move towards socialism. It was a question of those opportunities which were realised later, but the conditions for which were created precisely by the devel-

opment of imperialism and especially by the fact that prerequisites for breaching the imperialist system at its weakest link and ensuring the victory of the socialist revolution had already come into being.

In this respect the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the East differed substantially from the classic revolutions of the past. Firstly, in the past, there were no material, economic and social preconditions for the revolution to transcend its democratic limits, and secondly, despite the fact that many of these revolutions had a national liberation character, they were directed against the backward metropolitan countries (Spain, Austria, Turkey, etc.) and took place in relatively advanced countries. The liquidation of foreign political domination signified the elimination of the most reactionary element of the superstructure, and where these revolutions were victorious (in the Netherlands, Italy and other countries) they resulted in a rapid growth and consolidation of capitalist relations. As regards the East, the struggle against foreign domination there developed at a time when the "local" capitalist relations were still crystallising so that the success of bourgeois-democratic revolutions did not automatically signify the triumph of capitalism.

On the contrary, judging by past experience, a victorious national liberation revolution created opportunities for "avoiding", "interrupting" and "curtailing" capitalist development (the world's first socialist revolution was accomplished and the communist movement appeared at a time when the working class was still in the process of development). We would like to say here that in our opinion it would be just as incorrect to believe that the majority of the Eastern countries would remain a dependent periphery, chiefly of a pre-capitalist nature, of imperialism until its ultimate collapse and that they would be continuously dependent on developed capitalism within the framework of its world economy, as it would be to deny the possibility of anti-imperialist revolutions exceeding their bourgeois-democratic limits there.

Thus, bourgeois-democratic movements and revolutions in the East, which in a manner of speaking were taking place in different epochs, differed from similar phenomena in Russia in that, like the European revolutions of the 16th-18th centuries and of the first half of the 19th century, they at first passed through a general national stage, and from the latter, in that they had an opportunity to develop and considerably transcend their democratic limits.

Taking into account that the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement in the colonies and semicolonies acquired an anti-imperialist and national liberation character, Lenin put forward a slogan of great mobilising power: the right of nations to self-determination up to secession and the formation of independent states. It is particularly important to note that the slogan spoke about the self-determination of nations and not about the self-determination of the working people. Such a presentation of the national-colonial question was based on an objective assessment of the correlation of class forces in the national liberation movement in which the leading role was played by bourgeois classes, while a slogan calling for the self-determination of the working people would have been inconsistent with the tendency towards the formation of national states in the East and would have led to a split in the national liberation movement and refusal by the working people to participate in it. That was why the slogan of the self-determination of the working people was later advanced and supported precisely by those circles which considered that a socialist revolution, and not a bourgeois-democratic anti-imperialist revolution was on the order of the day in the East. Naturally, the slogan of the self-determination of nations up to secession and the formation of independent states, envisaged the emergence of conditions for a socialist revolution in one or another Eastern country some time in the future. The national self-determination of a given nation would have then signified the social self-determination of the toiling people.

* * *

Lenin wrote in 1915: "Imperialism is the epoch of the constantly increasing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of 'Great' Powers; it is therefore impossible to fight for the socialist international revolution against imperialism unless the right of nations to self-determination is recognised." * He held that the democratic revolutions and national liberation movements in the countries of the East were a component part of the general process of the socialist transformation of the world ("socialist international revolution against imperialism"), and that the promotion of the right of nations to self-determination slogan by the revolutionary pro-

* V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 317.

letariat was a means of drawing the peoples of the East into this process, which was consistent with the dominating tendency towards the formation of independent national states there.

Advanced in the epoch of the building up of the world socialist revolution, this slogan was designed to make the democratic and socialist revolutions to coincide in time, on the one hand, and, on this basis, to contribute to the creation of certain elementary preconditions for the struggle for socialism in the countries of the East, on the other. Thus this democratic slogan whose translation into practice was expected to take place in the course of the anti-imperialist struggle, in the final count acquired a potentially socialist content because it was also directed against capitalism. This became very clearly manifest in Russia during the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution in which the slogan of the self-determination of nations became a most important factor ensuring the effectivity of this development in the period of the transition from the February Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution to the October Socialist Revolution in 1917.

While formulating the principles of the self-determination of nations, Lenin also worked on the concrete aspects of the possibility of a democratic revolution in Russia developing into a socialist one: in Russia the Marxist-Leninist Party and the revolutionary proletariat advanced the slogan of the self-determination of nations at the democratic stage of the revolution in order effectively to promote its development into a socialist revolution. And when the socialist revolution was on the historical agenda in the West, and a democratic revolution was on the order of the day in the East, the slogan of the self-determination of nations in the East served as one of the "bridges" between them. Moreover, in Russia, within the limits of one country, both the democratic and the socialist revolutions were building up at one and the same time and were bound to merge. Socialist tendencies were very strong in Russia's working class as a result of the objective socio-economic and political conditions and the activity of the Bolshevik Party.

In 1915 Lenin considered that the proletarian party could come to power in Russia earlier than in any other Western imperialist country which had been involved in the First World War. In that case the victorious proletariat of Russia would carry out its programme-minimum by assisting the European proletariat and the peoples of Asia in their struggle against im-

perialism.* Raising the question about the possibility of the victory of Russia's proletariat already in the course of the war and earlier than in other countries, Lenin oriented himself on the rapid development of the democratic revolution into a socialist one and rejected the idea that there was a Chinese wall between these two stages. He wrote that in the first place the victorious proletariat would implement its programme-minimum. It can hardly be imagined, however, that in Lenin's opinion the proletariat, upon coming to power in Russia, would concentrate only on implementing its programme-minimum and then would wait and see in what direction revolutionary events would develop in the West. Lenin believed that consistent revolutionary-democratic transformations introduced under imperialism were a step towards socialism. It follows, therefore, that in 1915 he wrote about the possibility of a transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat as a result of the development of the democratic revolution into a socialist one at an accelerated pace inevitable in war-time conditions, and not about the possibility of the victory of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia.

Lenin was a genius above all because of his acute and correct prescience. He wrote about the possibility of the development of the democratic revolution into a socialist one both in 1905 and 1917, and his entire strategy after the 1917 February Revolution, which he outlined in his "April Theses", "Letters on Tactics" and other important documents of the period, was oriented on this development taking place.

This was by no means a question of the democratic revolution "running ahead of itself" and then "recoiling" but precisely of anticipated, objectively grounded phased development of the revolution in Russia supported by the proletariat of the West and by the peoples of the East. It was fundamentally important that Lenin did not associate the possibility of the democratic revolution in Russia developing into a socialist revolution with the victory of the revolution in the West.

Nothing could be more erroneous than to believe that in their approach to the question of the development of the 1905 Revolution into a socialist one, the Bolsheviks differed from the Mensheviks exclusively over tactical, and not over strategic issues. On the contrary, Lenin repeatedly emphasised that the development of the revolution to the socialist stage was the aim

* See V. I. Lenin, "Several Theses", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 404.

of the political course pursued by the Bolsheviks in the 1905 Revolution. As regards the introduction of the most determined efforts to bring the democratic revolution to completion, Lenin considered them as a condition for, and not as an alternative to, its development into a socialist revolution. In rebuffing the Mensheviks who accused him of voluntarism Lenin moved this condition into the forefront (i.e. to achieve a transition to the socialist revolution upon the consummation of the democratic revolution). In other words, his line of leading the revolution into its socialist stage was the antithesis not only of Menshevik strategy (bourgeois revolution, and no other), but also of the Trotskyite interpretation of the permanent revolution according to which a democratic revolution comes to completion with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat over the head of the peasantry.

It should be borne in mind that under certain conditions the policy of ensuring that the revolution moves from the democratic to the socialist stage may and sometimes does in fact end in failure. This happens when the non-proletarian forces are still incapable of coping with the tasks of the democratic revolution, and the proletariat and its party are weak, when revolutionary upheavals are neither powerful nor long enough seriously to shake the mainstays of the old society, when a considerable portion of the masses is under bourgeois influence, when the bulk of the progressive measures are introduced "from above" without the support of the masses, and the "permanency" of revolutionary progressive transformations is inadequate to ensure the "permanency" of the revolution. The party of the working class operating in a democratic revolution is far from always in a position to set the task of securing its transition to a socialist revolution, and is liable to err when it does so. In principle, however, by rejecting the theory of "transition" and the ensuing strategic line and adopting the tactic of getting the democratic revolution to "run ahead of itself", a Communist party which operates in a country where democratic tasks are still to be achieved, in effect gives up for good the political line of bringing the working class to power even in countries where it is realistic enough.

It can be said, therefore, that under all circumstances — irrespective of whether or not the development of a democratic revolution into a socialist one is advanced as an immediate task — a proletarian party strives, in contrast to the liberal bourgeoisie, to advance the first stage of the revolution "far

beyond the uttermost limits of the democratic revolution".* A deliberate repudiation of this principled position is reformism, and so is rejection of a transition to the socialist revolution where it can actually take place owing above all to the strength of the "class-conscious and organised proletariat".** At the same time the course of achieving the immediate transition from the first to the second stage under all circumstances and without consideration for objective and subjective, domestic and international conditions is adventurism and leftist voluntarism and, as a rule, leads to dire consequences and defeat. The advancement of the democratic revolution beyond its "uttermost limits" provided all the necessary conditions are at hand paves the way for its eventual transition to the next stage.

All these general considerations concerning the political course of a proletarian party have fully applied and apply today to the activity of Marxists-Leninists in the countries of the East. There, as elsewhere, the strength of the "class-conscious and organised proletariat" as a key factor of the transition to the socialist stage of the revolution is determined by a favourable combination of objective and subjective, internal and international conditions. As regards the objective internal conditions, the most important are the level, the nature and the extent of development of capitalism in the countries of the East.

Lenin maintained that capitalism in the East would develop along the lines of European capitalism. At the same time he noted the distorted, ugly forms of the development of capitalism in the colonies.

In other words, in their dialectic unity both factors were and are of considerable importance. On the one hand, the development of capitalism led to the emergence of the proletariat and the rise of the capitalist social and economic structure; on the other hand, the development of capitalism in the colonial periphery naturally differed from the way it developed in the home countries: survivals of fettering, pre-capitalist relations still existed and were even predominant in some countries; in many colonies the period of primary capitalist accumulation had been already extended over decades and even centuries, tribal

* V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 124.

** V. I. Lenin, "Social-Democracy's Attitude Towards the Peasant Movement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 237.

and patriarchal relations and multiplicity of social and economic structures continued to exist, and traditional forms of economy proved to be extremely viable. As a result of the interaction of all these numerous factors—the growth of foreign and local capital in width and depth (the formation of the leading, but as yet not the predominant capitalist structure) and the distinctive subordinate, peripheral, agrarian and raw materials functions of a colony—the forces opposing imperialism and the ugly forms of semifeudal and semicapitalist exploitation which came into being due to the disintegration of traditional society, superimposed upon each other, became amalgamated and brought to life very powerful popular movements. As he assessed the prospects of the liberation movement in the East, Lenin invariably took this objective situation into account.

He predicted that in the long run these movements would turn against capitalism. And the significance of this prediction as a most outstanding scientific accomplishment of the genius of the socialist revolution is becoming fully manifest in our day and age. There can be no doubt that in the nearest future we shall witness numerous examples of the development of the democratic, anti-imperialist stage of the revolution into its socialist stage. It goes without saying that this prospect is closely associated with the possibility of the replacement of capitalist social relations with socialist relations even before the former attain full development.

How can the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples initially spearheaded against imperialism turn against capitalism? In the first place it is necessary to ascertain the socioeconomic basis of such a tendency and only then take up the question of a corresponding tactic of the working-class party. After Lenin the question of the orientation of these movements against world capitalism was thoroughly studied by the Comintern (Communist International), the CPSU and other fraternal parties, and by Marxist scholars. By opposing colonialism, the exploited peoples of the East were hitting against the imperialist metropolitan countries and consequently were opposed to capitalism. Taking this into account Lenin held that the establishment of a lasting alliance between these peoples, on the one hand, and the international proletariat, on the other, was one of the most important tasks of the Communist parties of the oppressed countries.

This objective anti-capitalist orientation could also be an in-

herent feature of the movement of peoples who thus far had no capitalism of "their own". As regards countries which had already covered a certain distance along the capitalist road, the movement of the popular masses — hired labourers — developing there was also directed against "their own" bourgeoisie, and the anti-capitalist struggle gained momentum also on the basis of "their own" capitalism. And yet a very important feature there, as compared with the West, was that from the initial "economic" level of the class struggle, the workers, surmounting difficulties and resisting nationalism, gradually turned to independent political actions and at the same time continued to participate in anti-colonial movements that were inspired by anti-imperialist nationalism and guided by national-bourgeois circles.

* * *

As he developed Marx's and Engels' ideas, Lenin evolved a concept that colonial and semicolonial countries could either bypass or substantially shorten the capitalist stage of development. The idea of the "abandonment" of the capitalist path was a scientific discovery.

It was made shortly after the emergence of the first state of the victorious proletariat, at a time when Communist parties and popular revolutionary organisations were only just beginning to form. In many respects Lenin's discovery provided an answer to the question about the paths of development of the backward countries which Marx and Engels presented in theoretical form over a period of 25-30 years, from the 1870s to the end of the century. As soon as this historical possibility appeared Lenin boldly proposed that the entire international working-class, communist and national liberation movement should concentrate on realising it. At the same time it did not rule out the other possibility — that of carrying through the transition from a democratic, national liberation revolution to a socialist revolution under the guidance of a Communist party. On the contrary, the efforts which were made to translate the first possibility into reality — consolidation of the ranks of active Communists, activity of popular organisations, and the influence exerted by the state of the victorious proletariat — were an essential precondition for the realisation of the second possibility.

However, inasmuch as the idea of the "abandonment" of the

capitalist path, put forward at a time when the revolutionary movements in the East acquired a centre of consolidation in the person of the Soviet state, was connected with the appearance of a new situation in which the possibility of "bypassing" or "cutting short" the path of capitalist development no longer depended on the rise of a Communist party to power, it became necessary to evolve such a form of struggle which would secure the gradual transition to socialism without passing through the stage of capitalism. As a result the term "non-capitalist path of development" became current in the Comintern. But since it was first applied in reference to the prospect of the Chinese revolution, as there is every reason to believe, it also presupposed that this path could be adopted under guidance of a Communist party, and, consequently, reflected the specific features of a socialist revolution in a backward country characterised by a relatively early "cutting short" of capitalist development. Later the term came to signify a "specific degree" of departure from capitalism and gradual transition to socialism, when the guiding role was played by revolutionary-democratic forces.

Naturally, the exacerbation of class contradictions intensified the political struggle, which in fact was their reflection, in the popular organisations, as was the case, for example, in the Indonesian People's Union Party — Partai Serikat Kerakjatan Indonesia — and the Kuomintang in China. In general three main socio-political forces fought for power in these organisations (all this took place after the October Revolution: Lenin's conclusions concerned the entire historical period of the transition to socialism; furthermore the situations which took shape in some countries in the 1920s are only just beginning to emerge in others). They were the bourgeoisie, the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, and the political forces representing them.

People's organisations did not last long. In the course of the struggle of class forces party-type organisations emerged within their framework: bourgeois, petty-bourgeois (of diverse political orientations) and proletarian parties. Historically, this was a natural process, for a people's organisation could exist as more or less undivided whole only in a society which had not yet been divided into classes or where class differentiation was only in its initial phase. As regards the striving of national revolutionaries to form their own parties which manifested itself at the time when a number of countries began to "bypass capitalism", it also signified the adoption of the Marxist tenet that

the socialist transformation of society was possible only under the guidance of an organised revolutionary party (without taking into account the fundamental conclusion that only a party of the working class could bring this task to completion).

Where the bourgeoisie became the leader of the people's movement, the possibility of taking the non-capitalist path was naturally not realised. Where the Communist parties secured leading positions, socialist revolutions were eventually consummated. Where hegemony was gained by the revolutionary-democratic political trend (the logic of the tense anti-imperialist struggle caused the revolutionary democrats to introduce anti-bourgeois measures), the movement "in circumvention of capitalism" * began, in conditions of the existence of world socialism which demonstrated how the problem of overcoming backwardness and winning political and economic independence could be solved.

At the same time the political point of departure for this movement did not minutely coincide with the coming of one or another revolutionary party to power, for it, too, had to evolve politically and ideologically. As these countries strengthened their orientation towards socialism, revolutionary democrats began to apply some tenets of Marxist-Leninist theory, primarily those which they needed in order to solve their immediate tasks. It was a sort of an amalgam. But in the broad historical sense the transition from pre-capitalism or capitalism to socialism has always been a movement towards, and not away from Marxism, a specific form of the penetration and spread of Marxism-Leninism in the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of the East. Generally speaking it is a question of the ideological influence of the revolutionary working class on the revolutionary democracy and the toiling masses which it guides. It is a most complex and uneven process, even though there have been cases when national-revolutionaries and revolutionary democracy, or some of its prominent leaders, did shift to Marxist-Leninist positions.

It took more than 50 years and in some countries even longer for scientific socialism to fuse with the working-class movement in the West. So far no decisive headway in this direction has been made in the USA, Canada, the FRG, Britain and some

* The movement "in circumvention of capitalism" carried out on the borderlands of tsarist Russia and in the Mongolian People's Republic is not examined here.

other advanced Western countries, and as regards the East, this process is even more complicated and prolonged. As a rule the principles of scientific socialism find their way into a non-proletarian movement piecemeal whereas Marxism is an integral system of views. Moreover, as they come up against and fuse with traditional consciousness, Marxist ideas become greatly transformed and at times even acquire a negative, nationalistic colouring.

Historically, however, this fusion is a process of vast progressive importance: in the first place, the liberation movement on the whole is moving towards Marxism-Leninism, and not away from it or against it; in the second place, even at the given stage the individual socialist principles and ideas which revolutionary democracy has adopted are effectively utilised in the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle and, particularly, in ensuring the constructive activity of a national-democratic state. The "fusion" in the East is attended by very considerable difficulties. But it should be borne in mind that in the West, too, this process by no means developed smoothly, and that "amalgamation" was and still is under way there.

Post-war historical experience, i.e. the experience of the period of the formation and consolidation of world socialism and the final disintegration of the colonial system, has shown that the non-capitalist path remains open to those Asian and African countries where the capitalist structure has not become predominant. Whether they avail themselves of this opportunity, which becomes more and more attainable as world socialism continues to gain in strength, depends on many factors: on the correlation of class forces in a given country, on the ability of the anti-imperialist leadership consistently to carry through democratic transformations; on the political regime which either holds revolutionary-democratic tendencies in check or gives them a certain amount of leeway; on whether socialist ideas are widespread or not; on the relations of a given country with the socialist community, and so forth. The realisation of this opportunity largely depends on the Communists.

The tactics and strategy of the Communists in capitalist-oriented Eastern countries are above all designed to lead them off this path. In order to do so the Communists must unfailingly cooperate with national-revolutionaries and revolutionary democrats: this is an essential condition for the success of all anti-imperialist forces which do not regard capitalism as a remedy against age-old backwardness. Under these circum-

stances the slogan calling for a transition to the non-capitalist path is in fact orientation towards such a class shift to the left which would bring consistently democratic forces to power. They will fail to achieve their tasks without making "steps towards socialism", but they will only be able to make these steps on the basis of "left-wing bloc" tactics. In practice, this often amounts to the organisation of mass pressure on bourgeois democracy thus helping it to realise its progressive potentialities, and at the same time the setting of democratic tasks which its most consistent wing that has become revolutionary-democratic or is capable of becoming such will be able to fulfil. Hence, the adoption of the non-capitalist path lies through a "shift" to the left of a united front (in which the Communist party or Communist groups retain ideological and political independence). This shift would signify the assumption of power by the more radical groups of bourgeois democracy, and also their transition to more consistent positions corresponding to the interests of the broad masses whose pressure alone can create conditions for such a shift.

The opposition of the reactionary forces may very seriously affect this process. Under one set of conditions they can inhibit it, while under another they may provoke a conflict which will accelerate it and create a situation compelling the ruling faction of bourgeois democracy, which often adheres to centrist views, to shift to the left in order to retain its positions.

Thus the adoption of the non-capitalist path is a phased process and the Communists who are interested in it more than anyone else cannot bring about such a shift at will. It is therefore a question of a slogan designed to cover the entire democratic-revolutionary process which takes place both "at the bottom" and "at the top". The first steps towards socialism are taken when this process is nearing completion but that does not mean that it comes to a stop. It is also necessary to bear in mind that the promotion of the slogan calling for the adoption of the non-capitalist path by no means implies that it also calls for a socialist revolution, the establishment of a people's democracy and assumption of power by the Communists, for that would amount to asserting that only a proletarian takeover is capable of solving the problems of a democratic revolution. By putting forward the slogan calling for the adoption of the non-capitalist path, the Communists want to deepen democratic, anti-imperialist transformations and at the same time to orient them towards socialism.

Taken as a whole the national bourgeoisie opposes the tendency to lead the country off the capitalist path of development; in this case the leadership of the struggle is usually assumed by a new faction which is either more left or left of centre, and which is also inclined to counteract the developing revolutionary process in furtherance of its bourgeois interests. This leads to a political division of the bourgeoisie and the emergence of the urban petty bourgeoisie and the anti-imperialist, patriotic intelligentsia, including the democratic sections of the military officers, into the forefront.

The political course of the Communists in countries which had already abandoned the capitalist road takes into account the behaviour of the revolutionary democracy. Whenever national-revolutionaries and revolutionary democrats display an inclination to align their positions with the principles of scientific socialism they get every encouragement from the Communists who make sure to ascertain whether this rapprochement is real or whether it is only designed to put a socialist colouring on nationalism.

Things are different where the national democracy has come into reverse and thus can bring about a return to the capitalist path. This is all the more possible because national democracy is inclined to petty-bourgeois vacillations and, unlike the tested proletarian fighters-internationalists, it is incapable of consistently overcoming the pressure of imperialism, reaction and petty-bourgeois elements. Upon coming to power the possibility of a turn of its leadership to a bourgeois stand is not ruled out. In this case the Communists' position is clear: they oppose this backward movement.

Finally, it is particularly important for the Communists to formulate a correct political line in a situation when revolutionary democrats pursue a progressive policy and carry out profound social transformations. The Communists who enter into a political bloc with them make it their direct objective resolutely and consistently to fulfil the common tasks of the country's non-capitalist development in the interests of the toiling people and simultaneously boost the political influence of the proponents of scientific socialism and consistent anti-imperialism. Under these circumstances it is extremely important realistically to assess the alignment of class and political forces, and to wage a struggle for the vital interests of the working people linking it directly to the struggle for the most consistent implementation of the common programme. In such a situation

Communists no longer act within the framework of a national front, for the progressive blocs which take shape embrace the champions of the socialist transformation of society.

Such blocs were formed in a number of liberated countries as a result of serious changes in the objective class basis and with the view to achieving unity of action of progressive forces at the national-democratic stage of the anti-imperialist revolution. As this revolution advances the working class, the peasantry and broad non-proletarian toiling masses and their political leaders more and more resolutely demand the introduction of consistent social transformations. The old forms of the anti-imperialist front lose their viability and are superseded, and those forces which comprise or could comprise an anti-bourgeois bloc increasingly operate as anti-capitalist forces. Nevertheless the course towards the unification of these forces is merely a natural continuation of the united front policy. This is because it is always oriented on rallying the social classes and strata and political groupings which are objectively interested in solving the tasks of a given, mature stage of the revolutionary process unfolding at the moment. Consequently, the above course makes it possible to draw a considerable portion of the middle sections of the population into the national front of a new type.

Accordingly, the authority wielded by this sort of alliance, in which revolutionary democracy plays the leading role, is to some extent a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the non-proletarian and proletarian toiling masses in which the middle strata also participate. That such a national front of a new type could be created was enunciated by the international communist movement in 1960 as it more and more searchingly examined the prospects of the struggle for social progress by the peoples of the imperialism-oppressed countries, formulated the conception about the increased chances of these countries taking the non-capitalist road in the new conditions, the growing role of revolutionary democracy in this process and the concrete forms of a bloc of the left forces in the East.

Experience shows that a Communist party operating in an Eastern country, under conditions of an incompleting democratic revolution, that is, where this stage has been partially or fully bypassed, can come to power as a force concentrating within itself the revolutionary energy of society (particularly as an organiser of national salvation). This, however, is not a general rule. Therefore the Marxist-Leninist Communist

parties in Asian and African countries have not set themselves the task of winning power immediately and at whatever cost. If adopted, this course, which is inconsonant with the actual state of affairs, could split the national front, isolate the Communists from the masses and result in the adoption of putschist tactics amplified by opportunistic aspirations to gain power by infiltrating the state apparatus which stands in opposition to the Communists (such precisely was the course of events in Indonesia in the period from 1959 to 1965). The road to winning over the masses and increased political influence — and this is the main aim of a Communist party — lies through a struggle for the immediate political and economic interests of the working class, the peasantry and all the toiling people, through activity within the framework of the front of progressive forces.

The Communists' political course towards national democracy in Asian and African countries now takes into account the fact that the working class alone cannot solve the problems of the revolution arising at all the stages of its historical development. It is clear that by its revolutionary activity the working class is called upon to stimulate the activity of the other oppressed sections of the population and get them to solve these problems, for the political might and activity of the non-proletarian toiling masses directly further the interests of the proletariat.

National democracy, which reflects the political platform of the non-proletarian toiling masses in Asian and African countries, has proved its ability to carry out the programme of a democratic revolution. In the opinion of Marxists-Leninists this is good and not bad, because among other things it is a result of the experience acquired by the broadest masses participating in the anti-imperialist struggle and of the great revolutionising influence exercised by the world socialist system and the international working-class and communist movement, and also because it expedites the revolutionary process in Asian and African countries and further enhances its mass nature. It is hardly possible at present to say exactly when revolutionary democracy in the East will exhaust their potential. But one thing is clear: until this happens, any attempt "to replace them and solve their problems for them" would be harmful to the Communists and the revolutionary democracy, and to their common cause of the revolution and social progress.

Communists have their own ideology and ideas and do not conceal them. At the same time Marxist-Leninist theory envis-

ages that the Communists are interested in seeing the non-communist progressive forces, above all the non-proletarian toiling masses, to make the most of their revolutionary potential; that the Communists can move into the forefront of a popular movement only by rendering all assistance to these forces in the realisation of their revolutionary possibilities, and that the defeat of these forces would not necessarily signify the automatic transition of influence, prestige and power to the Communists. Therefore, when the revolutionary democracy carries out many measures which the Communists, if they were in power, would have possibly carried out by employing other methods and in different forms, these measures should not be criticised simply because they are promoted by revolutionary democrats, and not Communists.

The Communists manifest their independence not by "overtaking" revolutionary democracy "from the left", but by steadfastly adhering to Marxism-Leninism and formulating a correct political course on its basis. When a Marxist-Leninist appraisal of a period of historical development dictates the need to support revolutionary democracy, this does not imply that the Communists are losing their ideological, political and organisational independence: it merely shows that they are using it correctly in the interests of the working class and all the toiling masses, in the interests of the people as a whole.

* * *

It goes without saying that social and economic backwardness is far from being an asset. But a conscious revolutionary force can use the conditions engendered by material, technical, social and cultural backwardness in the sense that the objective tasks of surmounting backwardness (domination of pre-capitalist relations and traditional social structure) will be solved as a byproduct of the social transformation of society provided the material prerequisites for them already exist or are "in the process of formation"* (and these prerequisites take shape on an international as well as on a national scale). It should be noted, however, that such "superimposition of epochs" does not by itself create conditions for accelerating the transition of a democratic movement to socialist rails and even less so for consolidating this "surge forward".

* Karl Marx, "Preface to 'A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy'", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 504.

It is not only a question of who began a socialist revolution, but also of who will follow suit. If we agree that the "superimposition of epochs" is an essential and adequate condition opening the way for the first socialist revolution, there is every reason to say the same about all the subsequent socialist revolutions. But then this would mean that the working class of the West, where there is no such "superimposition of epochs", allegedly has no conditions for consummating a socialist revolution. If the "superimposition of epochs" is all that is needed to accelerate the transition to a socialist revolution, then now is the time for the proletariat of India and some other countries to start working in this direction. If, on the other hand, the mere accomplishment of democratic changes, and not the development of the revolution beyond its bourgeois-democratic framework in the direction of socialism is proclaimed as an alternative to the unrealistic "accelerated transition" to socialism, then non-capitalist development is doomed to failure. In this case, however, the frequently raised question, "What is the non-capitalist path of development?" poses itself once again.

It is doubtful that the question is worded correctly and usefully. Indeed, why is it usually couched exactly in these terms? It would have been more logical to ask: What are the laws and regularities and the specific features of the extant phenomenon which is called the "non-capitalist path of development"? In the first case the question is posed more or less abstractly, out of context of the actual situation in a socialist-oriented country or group of countries. Therefore there can be many answers, none of which could be regarded as exhaustive and consequently as either correct or incorrect. In the final count, every term whose interpretation still lacks widespread recognition and has not become traditional, elicits a degree of doubt if it is not accepted as adequate to reality. It is not a matter of one or another interpretation of the term, but of discovering and correctly understanding the phenomenon for which a new term has to be devised.

Thus a study of the causes that led to the appearance of the term "non-capitalist path of development" should, as we see it, also be conducted from these positions. The first term which was used to describe this phenomenon was couched in different words: the "Supplementary Theses" for the Second Congress of the Communist International (1920) submitted to the Congress by the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions (Lenin was its chairman and the theses were approved

by the Congress) spoke of the movement towards communism "not through capitalist development", bearing the "backward countries" in mind.*

There is no doubt that despite its importance the question of the possibility of bypassing or cutting short capitalist development in the backward countries was a derivative of the possibility of the victory of a socialist revolution and the building of socialism in Russia and then in other European countries. And here, too, the issue was not confined solely to the influence of the October Revolution on the backward countries.

The most important thing was that the October Socialist Revolution and the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia not only gave a fresh impulse to the development of Marxism but also introduced momentous modifications into the theoretical concepts that were prevalent among Marxist circles prior to the October Revolution. Until then it was believed that socialism would triumph as a result of a gigantic socialisation of production under capitalism. This would come about as a direct result of a political revolution of the proletariat which would rend the state-monopoly shackles that impeded this socialisation. Accordingly, it was not envisaged that the victorious proletariat would have to create the basic material and cultural prerequisites for the establishment of socialism. But developments in Russia showed that due to the uneven economic and political development of individual countries in the imperialist epoch there was a possibility of just this variant. Lenin's discovery and his arguments in support of this possibility were a brilliant triumph of revolutionary dialectics, a tremendous step forward in the development of Marxist thinking. They formed a theoretical foundation for the subsequent conclusion that capitalist countries with an average level of development could move into socialism and that socially and economically underdeveloped countries of the pre-capitalist type could come to communism bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

Once the first conclusion (concerning the creation of a range of material and cultural prerequisites for the establishment of socialism by the victorious proletariat) was made, it was only natural to draw the next conclusion (about the possibility of bypassing the capitalist stage and bringing communism within

* See *V. I. Lenin i Kommunistichesky Internatsional* (V. I. Lenin and the Communist International), Moscow, 1970, p. 204.

the reach of the backward countries), which was a logical continuation and a particular case of the application of the first one. The fact is that in spite of the qualitatively different nature of power, the one and the other were based on a certain similarity in the trend of development and a recognition of the possibility, and under certain conditions of the necessity, of a long transitional period for building foundations of socialism. During this period the proletarian dictatorship would complete the creation of diverse internal prerequisites for a new social system which capitalism had left unfinished and which therefore were not fully developed when the political revolution actually took place. In the course of the solution of the second problem, which was to be reached in the absence of proletarian rule, the direct assistance on the part of the victorious proletariat in the advanced countries was an additional and decisive condition for bringing communism within the reach of the backward countries. As regards the aim and task (achievement of socialism) and general conditions (underdeveloped capitalist relations, the non-proletarian toiling masses—the peasantry—make the bulk of the population), they largely coincided.

Besides giving a tremendous impulse to the working-class movement in the West, the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia also inaugurated the movement towards socialism in Asia, in the East. Soviet Russia became the leader of this movement. Countries where capitalist relations were not predominant, not mature enough and did not embrace the bulk of the population, began to advance towards socialism. In countries where capitalist development is in its early stages, where it is only beginning or has not yet begun, where industrial capitalism and an adequate base of industrial production of machines have not formed, where peasants make up the bulk of the population, and commercial and usurious capital, even if it is associated with world finance capital, holds dominating positions, and where landed proprietorship and feudal survivals are predominant, the transition to socialism, naturally enough, has certain distinguishing features on the strength of which it has been termed “non-capitalist development”.

It would be unscientific to deny the anti-capitalist nature of the changes in the above countries on the grounds that they were backward countries, that the Communists in them did not constitute the sole force guiding social change and that the regimes within whose framework non-capitalist development was taking place repeatedly disclosed their internal weakness.

At this juncture it is necessary to refer to Lenin's famous work *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It* in which he makes the point that in order to live up to its name the revolutionary democracy has to move towards socialism by taking the road of socialist transformations.* This is precisely what is taking place now in some of the liberated countries. Only socialist-oriented, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist transformations can stand in the way of and beat off the onslaught of reaction and imperialism.

A cardinal problem is the ascertainment of objective conditions for the transition of the backward countries to the non-capitalist path of development.

The most important of these conditions is the increasingly uneven economic and political development within the capitalist world in the imperialist epoch. In particular this is true of the contemporary period, a period of the general crisis of capitalism when this unevenness has found its reflection in an unprecedentedly acute global antagonistic contradiction between a handful of imperialist states and the oligarchic elite of the international supra-national monopolies, on the one hand, and the majority of the population of the capitalist world concentrated in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Tropical Africa and Latin America, on the other.

Usually capitalism's uneven development in the imperialist epoch is viewed as a condition for the victory of socialism in one country. But this unevenness, particularly after socialism had triumphed in one country and even more so after the formation and consolidation of the world socialist system, increases the diversity of ways of effecting the transition to socialism, a diversity which Lenin envisaged, though only theoretically, and brought to the knowledge of the international communist movement. If contemporary capitalism developed more evenly than it did during the domination of the colonial system, if this development had a levelling effect upon the citadels of capitalism and its periphery, if capitalist relations sprouted in all countries at one and the same time and with a comparable degree of intensity, there would have been no diversity of forms, rates, scopes and methods of change during the transition to socialism (even including such a general and fundamental distinction as the one which exists between the

* See V. I. Lenin, "The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 329, 357-59.

highly developed capitalist states and the backward countries with multistructural economies).

As a result of the uneven development in the epoch of imperialism the liberated countries found themselves in some respects beyond the pale of the capitalist system, above all as regards the level of their material and productive forces and technical and general culture. So far capitalist relations are not predominant in all of them, quantitatively small-commodity and subsistence economy still holds a key position, and the imperialist world, as an alien and exploiting system, still stands in opposition to them. At the same time world capitalist economy in many ways dictates to the liberated countries the direction and the rate of development, and the capitalist structure has not only emerged in many of them a long time ago, but is also developing.

It follows, therefore, that when it is said that it is possible, both in principle and in practice, to bypass capitalism on the road to socialism, this tenet should not be regarded as unconditional and absolute. As a world-scale formation, a world capitalist economy, and a world capitalist market capitalism has been in existence for a long time now. The liberated countries which are following the non-capitalist road and are striving to reject capitalism, a world system that includes the colonial world chiefly into its external orbit, do so because as an exploiting system world capitalism does not give them a chance to take advantage of the positive results of the material, technological, production and cultural progress of bourgeois society. Capitalism continues to regard them as dependent countries; it continuously reproduces and, with the help of economic measures, increases this dependence and parasitically uses it to further its own selfish interests. Thus the capitalist system with its ever increasing uneven development is the permanent condition which nourishes the desire of the liberated countries to break out of its clutches and take the non-capitalist path of development.

Sometimes attention is centred chiefly on the economic aspect of the problem of non-capitalist development, i.e. on the need to overcome backwardness. This is a vital issue, of course. When the problem is approached from this angle it becomes clear that capitalism not only builds up and perpetuates backwardness and does not permit the productive forces on its periphery to develop above a certain minimum, but also widens the gulf between the liberated countries, on the one hand, and

the industrialised capitalist countries, on the other, at each consecutive stage of its uneven development (in the beginning of the 1960s, this gulf was expressed by a ratio of 1:10-12 and by the mid-1970s, by a ratio of 1:18-20). The problem, however, involves not only the need for, but also the possibility of, overcoming backwardness. It turns out that owing to its uneven development and inexorable decay, capitalism creates conditions for the former colonial world to overcome its backwardness and, moreover, to do so along other, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist lines. In order to solve the problem of overcoming backwardness along the capitalist road, capitalism would have had to ensure the even development of the countries involved. The liberated countries are able gradually to orientate themselves towards socialism precisely because imperialist capitalism, in keeping with the immanent laws of its development, continues to be the main and universal exploiter in these countries even after they win political independence.

As regards the subjective aspect of the problem, it is above all a question of the political form of the movement along the non-capitalist path. But the solution of this question also hinges on the objective aspect. Since the liberated countries are developing as a society occupying a special place in the capitalist world and not as a formed capitalist society, it would be incorrect to think that they consist of exactly the same socio-economic groups as those existing in the capitalist West. This means, therefore, that the political role played by the social groups in these countries which are nominally identical to those in the industrialised capitalist countries, necessarily differs from the role played by the social groups in the latter.

It is absolutely clear that repudiation by the Communists of the crucial political conclusion about the possibility of the backward countries developing along the non-capitalist road, a repudiation which in the final count would end up in an attempt to squeeze the specifics of these countries into a procrustean scheme expressing qualitatively other conditions, would have been tantamount to arbitrarily depriving the developing countries of a socialist prospect. The alternative prospect, that of stewing in capitalist production for a hundred or a hundred and fifty years and then effecting the transition to socialism, is pseudo-revolutionary.

It is impossible to say exactly where a major breakthrough to socialism will take place — in the advanced capitalist world or in the liberated countries. Who could have imagined that such

a breakthrough would take place in a backward and, as Lenin put it, savage Russia. He and the Russian Communist Party believed that in principle Russia, in spite of her backwardness, could become the vanguard of a socialist revolution, and accordingly prepared the working class and the non-proletarian toiling masses for consistent revolutionary actions. Therein lay their great service to mankind. They disregarded jeers of the orthodox dogmatists and their outcries about the immaturity of capitalism and consequently the impossibility of effecting the transition to socialism, they ignored the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Trotskyites who wailed about Russia's backwardness and low cultural level, and refuted their allegations that these factors automatically turned Russia into Europe's rearguard which, according to the bookish discourses of the wisest of reformists, had to postpone the transition to socialism until her turn arrived.

To give up the non-capitalist alternative just because in its practical expression it differs from the outstanding examples of the already accomplished socialist revolutions means a refusal consciously to take advantage of those objective laws of the development of capitalism which tend to expedite its own doom, and above all a refusal to use the law of the uneven economic and political development of countries at the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism. If in 1917 the Communists of Russia had followed this course Russia would have effected a transition to a bourgeois republic dominated by capitalist relations, and not to the dictatorship of the proletariat and to socialism.

* * *

What place does the teaching about the strategy and tactics of the Communists (or about tactics in the broad sense of the word) occupy in the theory of scientific socialism? "No social order," wrote Marx, "ever perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself. Therefore mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, it will always be found that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or are at least in the process

of formation.” * The last words (“or are at least in the process of formation”) merit special attention. The establishment of capitalism in the leading European countries and its gradual transformation into a world system signified that the material conditions for the transition to the socialist order were already in the process of formation on a global scale.

That was when Marxism — the advanced system of thinking and a scientifically grounded task of the worldwide transition to socialism — came into being. This took place at a time when the material conditions for the transition to socialism had matured in only one European country, in England, where the machine industry had ousted manual labour, created an adequate base for the all-round machine reproduction of the means of production and consumption for itself and asserted the undivided rule of capitalist relations. Such an approach showed that Marx attached great importance to the subjective factor, mass action and organised struggle of the working people led by the working class. Inasmuch as the task of the socialist reorganisation of society arises in the period when the material prerequisites for socialism (and a corresponding social production) are still in the process of formation, society’s conscious vanguard has every reason to tackle this task, all the more so since the masses, first spontaneously and then with an ever increasing degree of awareness, rise to the struggle against the emergent capitalism.

This, naturally, implies that a society which objectively faces the task of going over to socialism does not necessarily have to mature to such an extent as to consist exclusively of the bourgeois and proletarian classes, and that in such a situation it is up to the working class to organise the broad non-proletarian toiling masses which are exploited and oppressed on both a national and international scale. Marx vigorously repudiated the thought that the unfavourable factor which was responsible for the defeat of the Paris Commune was “the general conditions of French society” ** where capitalist relations were only just beginning to take shape, and that consequently the Commune was doomed in advance.

It follows that a certain degree of maturity of economic con-

* Karl Marx, “Preface to ‘A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy’”, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 504.

** Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 248.

ditions creates an objective situation conducive to socialist revolution, but it does not in the least mean that there is no room for the subjective "will". On the contrary, these conditions enable the will and the purposeful activity of the most advanced class of society — the proletariat — which wins all the oppressed and exploited sections of the population to its side, to become manifest and expedite the objectively developing revolutionary process. Since, however, it is not the subjective "will" of the revolutionary class alone, but the socio-economic conditions in their entire complexity and the unity of the objective and subjective factors that constitute the basis of the socialist revolution, it cannot take place until the material conditions, whose development in fact creates a conscious and competent "bearer of the revolutionary will", have attained a specific level; it can neither create these conditions nor operate independently of the level of their development and a corresponding nature of class differentiation and class contradictions. Revolutionary will alone cannot ensure the success of the revolution without taking into consideration this nature and the need for the optimum combination of the objective and subjective conditions of the revolution. Revolutionary will can most effectively influence the revolutionary process precisely when it fully takes into account social and economic conditions and the potentialities of the class forces these conditions determine. The will of the foremost class is concentrated in the party which acts in keeping with scientific socialism. Lenin has rendered a great service by evolving a teaching about a party of the new type and by building up such a party. The appearance of Marxist-Leninist parties in countries which formerly were only the objects of history, greatly enhanced the ability of the revolutionary working class actively to influence the course of the objectively developing revolutionary process.

The strategy and tactics of the Communists is a sphere of activity in which they endeavour most effectively to organise the ranks and guide the will of the working class and all working people, to steer them in a scientifically grounded revolutionary direction and to break down the resistance of the hostile classes which are determined to keep humanity within the framework of its pre-history. In doing this the Communists take into account the objective national factors in a given country and also international factors. Such in general terms is a definition of the functions of strategy and tactics in the system of the communist movement. The general laws of the world

revolutionary process which had been discovered by Marxism-Leninism also determine the general theoretical principles of its strategy and tactics.

Since the purpose of communist strategy and tactics is to enable the vanguard party most effectively to influence the revolutionary process, they are also designed to solve the main problem of any revolution, that of winning over the masses and correctly and successfully guiding their actions. This is the key principle of the Marxist-Leninist tactic (in the broad sense of the word): it is not a tactic of leadership, i.e. a tactic designed to form a bloc of leaders, but a mass tactic designed to bring together the entire proletariat and the non-proletarian toiling masses, i.e. to unify the majority of the population of any country.

Communist tactics are naturally designed in the first place to ensure the unity of action of the working class. But society, particularly that one in which the material conditions for socialism are still maturing, consists not only of the proletarians and the bourgeoisie and even objectively is not always on the verge of socialist change. That accounts for the continuous efforts of the Communists to create a situation in which the shift to socialism becomes a direct objective and is combined with such an approach to the revolutionary process that takes into account its phased character. Any major stage in a democratic or socialist revolution can be either compressed or extended in time, but inasmuch as it is in the interests of the masses (as they see it), it is impossible to avoid or leap over it without running the risk of sliding into adventurism and subsequently courting defeat. The continuity of the various stages of a democratic revolution and its eventual development into a socialist revolution depend on each given stage being brought to completion (by forces which stand at the head of the movement at the beginning of a given stage, or which are more radical). The completion of one or another stage is ensured also by the proletariat's readiness to assume the responsibility for solving this problem and to do so with the help of historically necessary allies. In other words, the strategy of the continuity of the revolution envisages a strategy of its phased development and vice versa.

Furthermore, the tactic of continuity does not rule out the employment, when necessary, of a tactic of containment. It is quite possible that under certain conditions a revolutionary party may find it necessary to check the spontaneous impulse of

the masses. This happens when the correlation of forces is clearly disadvantageous for the revolution and advantageous for the counter-revolution, when action is doomed to a temporary defeat and, being inopportune, may cripple the favourable prospects which are opening before the movement. Such containment is not designed to subject the spontaneously or prematurely acting revolutionary masses or individual revolutionary groups, which are eager to begin action, to the will of the ruling classes; on the contrary, its purpose is further to expand the movement, enhance its awareness, level of organisation and party spirit. As a result, in the final analysis the tactic of the conscious containment of the movement enables the masses to develop their revolutionary initiative to the full. This means that such containment is a part of the process of revolutionising the masses and not an independent tactic.

In its drive towards socialist revolution the proletariat forms diverse alliances each of which is consistent with the tasks of a given stage of the revolution and in each of which the proletariat with its party strives to prove to the masses that they are the most important force of the movement. By preserving and strengthening the alliance with the non-proletarian toiling masses and winning ever new positions during the democratic stage of the revolution the proletariat may become the leader of the revolutionary movement.

The proletariat rises to leadership in the revolutionary movement employing the tactic of a united front in its most diverse forms, and at the same time retains its class independence. The purpose of the united front is to use the pre-socialist stages of the revolution to the maximum advantage of the masses and to enhance the political influence of the working class. At the same time Communists are fully aware that the broadest sections of the toiling people are still under the political guidance of the non-proletarian sections and realistically appraise this fact as they pursue a united front policy. Only by operating within the framework of a united front as a force which holds the initiative and fights for political independence will the proletariat be able to extend and strengthen its political influence among the non-proletarian toiling masses and raise the democratic revolution to a higher stage of development. Practice has shown that a proletarian party cannot strive towards the establishment of a united front with the masses over the heads of their non-proletarian leaders, who still exercise considerable influence among the masses, without harming its own inter-

ests and the interests of the revolutionary movement as a whole.

The adoption of such tactics would have been tantamount to beginning from the end. In the first place, such leaders do not always guide and control a mass revolutionary movement. It is quite probable that such control, if it does actually exist, is due to the fact that these leaders at a given stage more or less adequately represent the interests of the masses; in the second place, if this is not the case, it is necessary to make the masses aware of this through their own experience. Hence the futility of the tactic of a united front only "below". There is reason to appeal to the masses over the heads of the "leaders" only when the latter have been discredited. But then it is no longer a question of forming a united front, that is an alliance of heterogeneous forces, but of directly rallying the masses to the banner of scientific socialism.

Now it is necessary to examine a concept connected with a somewhat sectarian understanding of the general principles underlying the tactics of Communist parties. Some people think that the Bolsheviks resorted to united front tactics only in the early 1920s, when the Civil War was drawing to a close. In fact, however, the united front policy with its diversity of content and forms is peculiar to the communist movement at all stages of the revolution. The Bolshevik Party's line of promoting the peaceful development of the revolution after April 1917 and organising mass pressure on the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries was designed to make the Soviets where they had majority assume full power, and at the same time to convince the masses that only the Bolsheviks in the Soviets represented their real interests. This course also reflected the desire of the Bolsheviks to force the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries to agree to the formation of a united revolutionary-democratic front in which the Bolshevik Party would retain its ideological and organisational independence. And it was only when the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries fully and openly went over to the side of the bourgeoisie in July 1917 that the Bolsheviks found it necessary abruptly to change their tactics. But this took place when the influence of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries was already plummeting, among other things because of their inability and unwillingness to accept the offer to form a united revolutionary-democratic front, and when they had exposed themselves as a "reactionary democracy", as a force pursuing

a "reactionary-democratic policy".* Class forces were rapidly grouping into two opposing camps: the bourgeois-landlord bloc and the reactionary wing of the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers that were rallying round the Bolsheviks, on the other. Besides having to deal with the Mensheviks and the right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Bolsheviks also faced an openly counter-revolutionary force, against whom the revolution was carried out. At the time there was no group (with the exception of Left Socialist-Revolutionaries) in Russia with which the Bolsheviks could form a united front, so the Bolshevik Party became the leader of all revolutionary forces in the country. If examined superficially, the situation which took shape appeared to have no connection with the united front policy. Actually, however, it was largely a result of the skilful implementation of this policy by the Bolshevik Party.

From the point of view of Lenin's theory, the strategy of the development of the revolution and the united front tactics should be examined from the standpoint of their dialectical unity. This means that a course of moving the revolution into a higher stage without following a course of establishing a united front usually produces a negative result. A revolution which strives towards victory logically and historically needs a united front of all classes and social strata capable of participating in it. On the one hand, a united front policy is designed to give the revolution an adequate mass basis which includes not only its loyal adherents but also vacillating elements and fellow-travellers; on the other hand, a united front tactic, if unaccompanied by a course designed to raise the revolution to a qualitatively higher stage, turns into an ordinary policy of forming an alliance with one or another social stratum which is dissatisfied with the existing order, a policy which Social-Democrats have been pursuing for many years thus restraining the masses from revolutionary action.

Another important tactical principle of the communist movement is the Marxist idea that no form of struggle should be absolutised; the only form of struggle which is chosen is the one which fully corresponds to the existing situation. Lenin exposed the opportunists who feared armed methods of struggle, most of all an historically mature and prepared uprising,

* See V. I. Lenin, "Heroes of Fraud and the Mistakes of the Bolsheviks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 44.

their inclination to resort only to peaceful and parliamentary forms of struggle even during revolutionary explosions, and their constitutional illusions. At the same time he criticised "left"-wing Communists who in principle repudiated peaceful methods of struggle, refusing to take part in parliamentary activity and in reformist trade unions and turning down all compromises.

There are also mixed concepts (comparisons): peaceful and non-peaceful means of struggle, on the one hand, and constitutional methods and dictatorship, on the other. There are circumstances when the main accent can be made on either peaceful or non-peaceful means of struggle, or on a combination of both. But only the establishment of the unrestricted authority of the revolutionary class can consolidate the gains of any major social revolution. Any deep-going intrusion into property relations, state domination and subjection encounters such powerful counteraction on the part of the expropriated ruling classes, which are also capable of effectively using the bourgeois-democratic Constitution to safeguard their class rule, that only the most resolute methods can prevent or crush their resistance. And it is not merely a question of the dictatorship of the proletariat; Marx, Engels and Lenin wrote that a democratic revolution, too, can be successful and can consolidate its victory only by establishing unrestricted popular rule which can use, but cannot rely on, the Constitution that was adopted in its time in the interests of the class that is being overthrown.

The strategy and tactics of the Communists are the strategy and tactics of the masses. Communists are the most consistent and foremost participants both in the socialist and in the pre-socialist stages of the revolution in which they most fully represent and uphold the interests of the masses. They fight for the satisfaction of the most vital, concrete and daily demands of the toiling people. One of the most important principles of the political behaviour of the Communists is their steadfast defence of proletarian internationalism combined with consistent patriotism. That explains why the national contingents of the great international army of Communists on more than one occasion saved their respective countries from catastrophes into which they would have been led by imperialism and reaction. And this to a considerable extent prompted the masses to rally round the Communists.

The basic principles of communist strategy and tactics, as has been confirmed by the course of events since the publication of

the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1848, are of international significance and can be universally applied. They were formulated on the basis of proletarian internationalism and fundamental propositions of Marxism-Leninism, by means of an analysis and generalisation of national, regional and world situations in the most diverse historical periods. This does not preclude but, on the contrary, implies the need to distinguish the tactics employed by the Communists under specific conditions from the general principles of the communist tactics. A national tactic, which cannot be the same in all countries and regions, is a concrete expression of the general principles that is consistent with local conditions. This, in particular, accounts for the fact that the worldwide policy of the international communist movement conforms to the requirements of the world revolutionary process as a whole, and also to the conditions obtaining in individual countries and regions.

* * *

Since capitalism entered its highest and final stage the revolutionary proletariat and its allies have been creating a united anti-imperialist front embracing on a national and international scale all the democratic forces interested in pursuing the struggle against imperialist oppression. As this complicated process developed the peoples suffering from colonial oppression ceased to be an object of history and became its subject, an active force of the revolutionary transformation of the world. Naturally, in the countries of the East where the proletariat was weak, the local national bourgeoisie assumed leading positions in many liberation movements and adopted anti-imperialist nationalism in all its varieties (Sun Yat-senism, Gandhism, Kemalism, etc.) as their ideology.

At the same time the movement of the toiling people in the colonies and semicolonies, with the help of which they intended radically to improve their social status and conditions of life, gained in scope and strength. At first this movement was not and could not have been guided by class awareness. In order to acquire a truly class character it inevitably had to pass through the stage of anti-imperialist nationalism and merge with the general national movement that was guided by non-proletarian (chiefly national-bourgeois) forces. This path mobilised the masses for a political struggle and only by participating in this struggle they became aware of their specific class interests.

As he evolved the teaching about imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Lenin attached a great deal of attention to the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. He was the first to realise that the colonial peoples could become an active force of the revolutionary transformation of the world, and spoke about the possibility of this taking place to his last days, particularly in "Better Fewer, But Better", "Our Revolution", "On Co-operation", "How We Should Reorganise the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection" and other articles. He was the first to ascertain that in the imperialist period the colonial and semicolonial peoples fighting against foreign oppression could and would become the allies of the revolutionary proletariat which was mustering forces for a socialist revolution. Regarding the socialist transformation of the world as a multifaceted, complex and protracted process, Lenin reached the conclusion that the liberation movements which were headed by the non-proletarian classes and not directly orientated towards socialism could furnish powerful support to the socialist proletariat.

That was how the idea of a united anti-imperialist front originated. From the very beginning it was a dialectical combination of two aspects — international and national. On an international scale it envisaged solidarity between the revolutionary proletariat and the East which had awakened to an active struggle; as applied to one or another colony or semicolony it envisaged that its nascent Marxist groups which historically would become the nuclei of Marxist-Leninist parties would work for the unification of the patriotic forces in their respective countries. Naturally enough, it was not envisaged that the formation of a united national anti-imperialist front in an oppressed country in that period would signify an immediate establishment of the hegemony of the still undeveloped working class and the Communists in the national liberation movement, just as it was not envisaged that an immediate establishment of Communist parties would be the main task in all countries where the proletarian movement was still weak. The first thing the Communists had to do was to independently serry their ranks and at the same time support popular movements and contribute to the formation and activity of mass popular organisations which were struggling against imperialism. In this way the Communist parties would gradually move into the vanguard of the struggle for national liberation.

When the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution resulted in the formation of the world's first proletarian state,

this struggle in which the Communists were playing an ever increasing, and in some countries even a decisive role, received powerful support from the victorious proletariat. Thus after the victory of the October Socialist Revolution the course of forming a united anti-imperialist front on a world scale was fundamentally modified. Now it was a question of rallying the revolutionary proletariat in capitalist countries and the national liberation movement round Soviet Russia—the centre and bastion of the world revolutionary process.

Prior to the October Socialist Revolution it was potentially possible to realise the idea of setting up a united anti-imperialist front on an international scale inasmuch as the peoples were turning into an increasingly formidable anti-imperialist force. But this was not done. Of course, the absence of a “centre of attraction” in the form of a country, or countries, of the victorious proletariat meant that a crucial condition which would have ensured the effective and full realisation of this possibility did not exist. There were also other factors which for a certain period of time prevented the idea of the formation of a united anti-imperialist front from being realised: the opportunistic policy of the leaders of the Second International; the refusal of the right-wing leaders of the international social-democracy to steer a course towards a socialist revolution; the failure to understand that under new historical conditions the oppressed peoples turn into an active anti-imperialist force; and finally the shift of the leaders of the Second International to chauvinistic positions.

It was only the appearance of the international communist movement which had nothing to do with opportunism and social-chauvinism, and the establishment of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat that paved the way for the formation of a united front. These two conditions emerged as a result of the activity of the Bolshevik Party and its leader, Lenin. Under his guidance the Bolsheviks performed the Herculean task of rallying the truly revolutionary elements of the international working class and winning over the great masses of the workers and peasants of Russia. The Great October Socialist Revolution was accomplished and the Third Communist International was formed. An era arrived in which the idea of forming a united anti-imperialist front both on an international scale and on the scale of any fighting colony or semicolony could be translated into practice.

At the Second Congress of the Communist International, in

1920, Lenin provided a comprehensive theoretical basis for this idea and also showed how it could be implemented. He laid down very important propositions not only in his "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions" and in the report which he delivered on behalf of the corresponding commission at the plenary session of the Congress on July 26, 1920, but also in his "Speech on the Terms of Admission into the Communist International" and in his discussions with M. N. Roy.

Studying M. N. Roy's "Supplementary Theses", Lenin deleted from this draft document of the Congress a whole system of "directives" which either consciously or unconsciously opposed the unification of all anti-imperialist forces in the oppressed countries and the establishment of an alliance between the liberation movement in the colonies, on the one hand, and the proletarian movement in the industrialised capitalist countries, on the other. The commission which worked under Lenin's guidance included into the Congress resolution a very important conclusion at which Lenin had arrived, namely, that it was possible to build communism bypassing the capitalist stage. The commission also took into account two crucial conditions which could and should pave the way for such a transition: the political activity of the toiling masses in the oppressed countries and the assistance of the class-conscious proletariat which had already come to power in one of the world's biggest countries. In this connection the formation of mass organisations of the toiling people in the countries of the East was designated as the Communists' most important task. These mass organisations which at first would not be communist could, as the Comintern justly believed, eventually acquire a popular, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist nature and their establishment, therefore, was viewed in direct connection with the possibility of bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

That was how the basic principles of the policy of the international communist and working-class movement towards the oppressed countries came into being. But all these ideas and premises were not inert formulas. From the very beginning the national anti-imperialist front was viewed as a coalition of heterogeneous socio-political forces, otherwise it would not have been a question of setting up a united front but simply of ensuring the growth of the numerical composition and influence of the Communist parties in the colonies and semicolonies. The composition of the forces that were capable of act-

ing against imperialism changed in the course of the struggle and phased development of the revolutionary process, and so did the correlation of these forces on a world scale and in each country separately. In one group of countries the Communists moved into the vanguard of the national liberation struggle, in another the bourgeoisie retained the leading positions, and in the third group revolutionary democracy increased its influence.

The Communists took the changes in the structure and aims of the liberation movements into account and in keeping with them introduced certain modifications into the policy of the united anti-imperialist front. For example, after the treachery of the Kuomintang leadership (Chiang Kai-shek) in 1927 the decision of the Communists not to recognise (for a certain period) the Chinese national bourgeoisie as an anti-imperialist force was quite justified. There was a period when the Communists became so resentful of the very considerable vacillations which beset national bourgeois circles in India that they considered it impossible to act jointly with them against imperialism. In this case, however, as experience subsequently proved, the Communists made a mistake; the evaluations of the behaviour of the Indian national bourgeoisie were one-sided and much too categorical. It is important to note that a united front is not an inert phenomenon; its aims and composition are liable to change, and that is amply proved by the experience of the international working-class and national liberation movement.

This was manifested to the full after the Second World War, when under the new conditions it became possible for a number of Asian and African countries to orientate themselves on socialism, i.e. to bypass or substantially shorten the period of capitalist development. Many of these countries realised this possibility. But the problem of preserving and strengthening the united anti-imperialist front acquired even greater significance in view of the advent of a new stage in the revolutionary process in these countries connected with the struggle for economic independence, the elimination of age-old backwardness and ensuring the evolution of anti-imperialist transformations into anti-capitalist transformations. The formation of a united front of anti-capitalist forces, or progressive forces as they are called in some countries, became an objective necessity.

The appearance of new objective aims inevitably led to a change in the class composition of the forces which were in-

terested in achieving them. The national bourgeoisie which formerly took part in the anti-imperialist struggle began to withdraw from it, for the new stage of this struggle clashed with their class and economic interests. On the other hand, the peasantry, the intermediate strata, the military and civilian intelligentsia, the students and all the other forces comprising the revolutionary democracy, which for a long time constituted merely the left flank of the national bourgeoisie, began to play an increasingly important role. An historically warranted period of a radical transformation of the class composition of the united front set in. Priority was given to formation of a left-wing bloc of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-capitalist forces. Under these circumstances the united front could not retain its old forms, and the policy of the united front pursued by the Communists had to be modified. Now the united front in the socialist-oriented countries concentrated not only on fulfilling anti-imperialist and national liberation tasks, but also on introducing far-reaching internal socio-economic transformations of an anti-bourgeois character in general.

As the colonial system started to crumble, power in the majority of the oppressed countries passed into the hands of the national bourgeoisie which ruled alone or in a coalition with the liberal landlords. But here, too, the composition of the forces capable of strengthening national independence and fighting for economic independence at the current stage of the revolutionary process has either changed already or is in the process of changing. In many of these countries some forces of the national bourgeoisie (those which are connected with the local feudal and bureaucratic sections, or which are interested in receiving support from foreign monopolies) have abandoned, or are abandoning, the anti-imperialist struggle and becoming a junior partner of the elements which are implanting the system of neocolonialism.

On the other hand, governed by the logic of the struggle against imperialism and the local reaction, the more radical petty-bourgeois strata, which have close economic and political ties with the national bourgeoisie but have become disenchanted with its leadership, are displaying a growing inclination to carry out resolute anti-imperialist measures and looking for support to the masses and their organisations in an effort to turn them into their mainstay.

Finally, there are liberated countries where Communist parties have come to power and are guiding the construction of

a socialist society. And here, naturally, the configuration of forces comprising the united anti-imperialist front has its fundamental distinctive features.

Today there are at least four possible "versions" of a united front. One version is when the national bourgeoisie (or national-bourgeois elements), or its most radical circles are capable of resolutely fighting for freedom and independence against imperialism and feudalism; under these circumstances the Communists are interested in extending their influence and in a united front policy which would enable these circles to display their progressive abilities. The other versions depend on conditions under which the national bourgeoisie can no longer play a definitive and positive role in the united front, for here the process of social change runs counter to its class interests. Under specific circumstances revolutionary democrats and Communists become the main forces of the united front (in those socialist-oriented countries where Communist parties are powerful enough). In other situations the leadership of the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle in socialist-oriented countries is almost wholly in the hands of the national, revolutionary democracy. There is also a version when a liberation movement is led by Communists who subsequently come to power.

It is clear that in spite of their difference the last three versions have a fundamental important common aspect: the anti-imperialist forces are oriented on deep-going socio-economic changes and this, naturally, influences the positions of the national bourgeois circles and, consequently, the policy which the forces guiding a country's socio-economic and political development pursue towards them.

The course of events in the East over the past several years has paved the way for the formation of a new type of a united front. In Syria and Iraq there appeared National Fronts of Progressive Forces in which the Communists, while retaining their independence, act in a bloc with the ruling revolutionary democracy. In the currently unfolding stage of the revolutionary process, the Communists act within the framework of these fronts as a consistent revolutionary force without laying claim to leadership. They support the progressive measures of the revolutionary democracy, uphold the interests of the toiling people, the working class in the first place, and work with a will to have the programme of the revolutionary democracy translated into reality. By doing all this they seriously help their

countries to advance along the non-capitalist road, the road of socialist orientation. The significance of Syria's and Iraq's experience will quite possibly transcend the limits of these countries.

The effective united front policy pursued by Marxists-Leninists was a crucial factor which made it possible to establish and safeguard people's democratic rule in Vietnam and Laos. Led by Marxists-Leninists the masses in these countries brought their armed struggle to a victorious conclusion. It should be noted that this struggle did not preclude, but on the contrary presupposed an active united front policy oriented on rallying all forces which want to bring down the pro-imperialist regimes, rebuff the aggressors, unify the country, achieve real political and economic independence and carry out deep-going social transformations. The victories in Vietnam and Laos confirmed the fact that an objectively necessary armed struggle, combined with a diplomatic and political struggle, can be a crucial and in a specific period the only way towards national unity and social emancipation (Cuba is a case in point). The Communists have never renounced this road which as a rule is imposed upon them by reaction and external imperialist forces. But they invariably maintain that a genuinely mass armed struggle cannot be replaced by unprepared adventuristic actions which lack the support of the masses.

Whatever the form a liberation struggle may take, the Communists, in order to bring it to a victorious conclusion, unflinchingly favour a united front of all anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-racist, patriotic, democratic and progressive forces whose configuration and interaction can and should change depending on the aims of the united front and on objective internal and external conditions.

It follows that the policy of a united anti-imperialist front (just as the policy of a united front of all democratic and progressive forces, i.e. a policy of a left-wing bloc) is an immanent factor of the international working-class and communist movement and emerged together with this great movement. Relying on Lenin's fundamental conclusions and taking full account of the changes occurring in the objective world situation, Marxist-Leninist parties continuously developed and concretised this political tactic.

Life shows that this policy can be conducted in the most diverse concrete forms, and international communist forums never fail to formulate them and orientate the united front

policy on the tasks which correspond to the new stages of the revolutionary movement. Such a creative approach to these problems was vividly manifested at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935, the International Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1957, 1960 and 1969. The deepening of the revolutionary process of liberation, the fact that it has come to embrace countries on all the continents and the diversity of forces involved in it, have given and will continue to give rise to ever new concrete forms of this policy of the anti-imperialist united front which is universally applicable in principle and at the same time dynamic.

The past three decades have witnessed a major shift in the general correlation of forces on the world scene in favour of socialism: a socialist community emerged and has become firmly established in the world; the colonial system of imperialism has been smashed; the young proletariat of the Asian and African countries has increased numerically and is solidifying into a vanguard revolutionary force and, at the same time, is developing economically, socially and politically. But it would be an unpardonable simplification to think that in this period the situation in the East changed to such an extent that the historical experience of the initial period of the liberation struggle which was waged by the Comintern and the CPSU, and the strategy and tactics of this struggle which were evolved in those years are no longer of topical significance. On the contrary, the principles of the strategy and tactics of the Communists in the East that had been evolved by Lenin and the international communist movement are as viable as ever before and are an asset to the contemporary anti-imperialist struggle taking place now, under new conditions, when the invincibility of world socialism has been established for a fact.

Why are these principles still viable? In the first place it should be borne in mind that the major economic, social and political changes taking place in a large group of economically underdeveloped countries in the East often confront the Communists there with the still unresolved and therefore important problems of national liberation revolutions, i.e. problems similar to those which, for example, faced the Communists of India, China and Indonesia in the 1920s (the problem of the leading role of the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist party, the class composition of the party, the proportion of workers in its membership, the specifics of its activity in revolutionary, democratic non-Communist organisations, the problem of

a united front of anti-imperialist and progressive forces). In the second place, as before, landless and land-hungry toiling peasantry, which is in bondage to the landlords and money-lenders, and also the deprived, pauperised lower urban strata make up the bulk of the population in Asian and African countries. In the third place, progressive reforms have radically undermined religious, tribal, national and caste traditions only in individual countries. In the fourth place (in order of succession but not in significance), imperialism, the landlords and now also the neocolonialist bourgeoisie which comprise the camp of reaction continue to be the main enemies of the peoples of the Asian and African countries. Such a combination of great changes and the amazing tenacity of certain socio-political features creates a conglomerate of situations under which the Communist parties in the East can in fact operate successfully by basing their activity on Lenin's principles of communist strategy and tactics in the oppressed countries of the East. These principles were enriched in the period when the socialist transformation of the world started up by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia had its first impact on the countries of the East and in the ensuing period, particularly after the rout of German fascism and Japanese militarism, the period of the collapse of the colonial system, and therefore were designed to cover the entire epoch of transition to socialism.

This being the case, recourse to the historical experience of the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement with respect to the countries of the East is a matter of very considerable scientific and political significance for the contemporary activity of the Communists in the theoretical field and also in their practical endeavours.

The policy of the Communists in the East naturally reflects the existing dialectical reality in that part of the world and the objective changes which have taken place there in recent years.

With respect to both the bourgeois-democratic countries and the socialist-oriented countries, which are developing along the non-capitalist road, it is above all necessary to take into account the correlation of "internal" and "external" aspects of the anti-imperialist struggle.

The situation today is much more complicated than during the struggle for national self-determination, i.e. for political independence, when the slogan of waging a direct fight against the imperialists proved to be a most effective instrument for uni-

ifying the masses and setting them in motion. It has become clear that the national anti-imperialist struggle will produce the most significant and reliable results and considerably accelerate the social emancipation of the people only during the national-democratic stage of the revolutionary process now unfolding in many countries. Hundreds of millions of peasants and workers are interested in the redistribution of landed estates, the improvement of living conditions, the ousting of foreign monopolies from key positions, the removal of landlord, bourgeois-landlord and bureaucratic oligarchies from power, i.e. in everything which a national-democratic revolution led by an alliance of the revolutionary democrats and Communists can swiftly and effectively achieve. In an Eastern country nothing can be more detrimental to imperialism's economic and political interests than the victory of a national-democratic revolution.

The logical shift in emphasis on the "internal aspect" of the anti-imperialist struggle, if correctly and consistently combined with the "external aspect", is in keeping with the new stage of the revolutionary process in the liberated countries (as distinct from a stage which may be tentatively called anti-colonial and anti-imperialist). This shift confirms the fact that historically anti-imperialist nationalism is only the first, initial form of political activity of the peoples of oppressed countries and that a new period has commenced in which domestic socio-economic transformations combined with the anti-imperialist struggle for equality in international economic relations become the principal forms of the national liberation movement. In their tactics the Communists of the East attach primary importance to ensuring the consistent and phased character of the national liberation struggle, the combination of political and socio-economic aspects of the mass movement, its timely shift to constructive efforts in the establishment of the national economy and improvement of the material conditions of life of the broad masses. Any violation of the strategy and tactics of the phased and consistent development of the national liberation struggle very often leads to a major defeat.

One of the most important causes of the defeat sustained by the Communist Party of Indonesia in 1965 was that after 1962, when the imperialist aggression against Indonesia was over and the country had entered a period of relatively peaceful development, the CPI leadership placed all its hopes on artificially fomenting anti-imperialist nationalism. At the same time it set aside such urgent tasks of the current stage of the waning

national-democratic revolution as democratic agrarian reforms, improvement of the position of the masses and the fight against bureaucratic capital which was assuming increasing power.

The Communist parties in the countries of the East can come to wield decisive political influence not only as organisers of a popular struggle against imperialist aggression, as was the case in China (1945-1949) and in Vietnam (1945-1975), but also as consistent fighters for the immediate political and economic interests of the masses at large. In this sense, the CPI leadership, which set out in pursuit of the "Malaysian phantom", has failed to take advantage of the real opportunities this influential party had at its disposal for further developing the national-democratic revolutionary process in depth.

A study of the experience of the Third World communist parties discloses that they concentrate increasing efforts on the struggle for the victory of the contemporary stage of the national-democratic revolution with its prospects for a socialist future. But where this process has not as yet acquired a revolutionary-democratic character, their attention is focussed on the struggle for the immediate interests of the working class, the peasantry and all the oppressed, regarding it as an essential condition for building up a political army of the national-democratic revolution.

In Iraq and Syria the Communists are acting in a united progressive bloc with the revolutionary democrats. Fairly good prospects are open to the Communists of the Philippines who consistently fight for the interests of the working people and for the expansion and consolidation of their gains. The Communist Party of Sri Lanka is working hard to implement its democratic programme. The Indian Communist Party acts with initiative as the leader of the class struggle of all the contingents of the working people against the forces of reaction and the domination of foreign and local monopolies, and stimulates the peasants to fight for land.

In general the strategic objective of the Communist parties of the East is the same as that of the Communists in the industrialised capitalist countries, namely, the creation of a political authority which would get the socialist transformation of society under way.

The Genesis of the Marxist-Leninist Conception of Non-Capitalist Development

The documents of the 1960 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out that the transition to non-capitalist development and the formation of national-democratic states was an immediate revolutionary perspective for many newly-liberated countries. At the time this idea was received with a certain amount of scepticism in some circles. Since then, however, all doubt on this score has disappeared. Non-capitalist development, or socialist orientation, which is the same thing, has in practice proved to be one of the highroads leading to social and economic progress which opens before the former colonial and semicolonial peoples the prospect of advancing towards socialism. Many Asian and African states have made considerable headway in this direction. Among them are Burma, Syria, Iraq, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Mozambique, Algeria, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, the People's Republic of the Congo, Tanzania and some other countries which are in the forefront of the national liberation movement. Influential political forces in the young states that so far have not made their final choice, or those that have taken the difficult path of capitalist development under pressure from the national-reformist leadership, are increasingly gravitating towards socialist orientation.

Non-capitalist development has become a reality of social and political life in Asia and Africa in the 1960s and 1970s. Today there can be discussions not over the possibility of non-capitalist development in principle (i.e. socialist orientation in

internal and foreign policy), but only concerning the interpretation of its substance, general laws, forms, methods, historical limits, stages and attitudes to socialism and capitalism. In seeking a solution to all these problems it will be expedient to examine how the conception of non-capitalist development appeared in Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Even a cursory study of the history of scientific socialism will suffice to rebuff those critics who, professing to safeguard the "purity of Marxism", assert that the idea of non-capitalist development advanced by the Communist parties in the 1960s is non-Marxist and even anti-Marxist. An examination of the genesis of the Marxist conception of bypassing or shortening the capitalist stage by the former colonies is also important in that it helps to refute the views of those ideologues and leaders of national liberation movements who draw their information about Marxism from biased sources and, being genuinely misled, insist that scientific socialism is allegedly inapplicable in the former colonies. Some of them consider that, since Marxism emerged in an advanced capitalist society, it is designed solely for it, and that any attempt to follow this teaching under conditions where pre-capitalist formations or systems are more or less predominant could signify only one thing: deliberate implantation of capitalism and instigation of class antagonisms for the purpose of using them and, in the final count, the dictatorship of the proletariat, to advance towards socialism.

The main purpose of a retrospective analysis of Marxist views on this issue is to disclose the content and diversity of the forms which the movement of the peoples of Asia and Africa to socialism may acquire.

* * *

Marx and Engels formulated the conception of non-capitalist development as far back as the end of the 1840s and then continued working on it in many of their works for almost half a century, right up to the beginning of the 1890s. This conception admirably exemplifies the application of dialectics. The founders of Marxism who devoted their research to ascertaining the laws governing the rise, development and demise of the capitalist formation, also brilliantly anticipated that this formation could be bypassed, or at least that the period of capitalist development could be substantially shortened.

It was a time when socialist revolutions were maturing in

some advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe, and consequently, this prediction was made in reference to those Asian and African countries whose peoples were still living under pre-capitalist conditions. Now they are living under the conditions of primary capitalist accumulation and the development of manufactory, or in the early phases of industrial capitalism.

It is very important that Marx and Engels ascertained the laws governing the growth of pre-capitalist relations after they had discovered the laws of the development of capitalism and bourgeois society. Having done this they ascertained that "the categories expressing its relations and the apprehension of its organisation also make it possible for all social forms which had outlived themselves to penetrate the organisation and the relations of production".* After studying the capitalist society they built a scientific and historical retrospective of the nature and structure of the preceding social formations and the basic socio-economic structures.

Marx and Engels who based the cognition of social development on historical materialism and materialistic dialectics, grounded not only the inevitability of the revolutionary transition from one formation to another, not only the transformation of socio-economic structures, but also their coexistence and interaction. Moreover, they presented argument in support of the idea that some individual formations and structures could drop out of the history of a particular section of humanity which, owing to certain circumstances, could either fully or partially bypass the stage that other countries have already left behind in their historical development thus making it redundant.

But this shortened path of historical development has become possible only as a result of the crisis of world capitalism and the victory of socialist revolutions in countries which have broken away from it. This possibility is ensured by the law-governed development of humanity as a whole on the basis of a full cycle, and the interaction and reciprocal assistance of its vanguard contingents, which had cast off capitalism, and of its rearguard, which is still at the stages of social development preceding capitalism or of primary capitalist accumulation.

Non-capitalist development also depends on specific interna-

* *Iz rukopisnogo nasledstva K. Marxa* (From the Manuscripts of Karl Marx), Moscow, Vol. 12, p. 731.

tional conditions: the simultaneous existence of the pre-capitalist environment (feudal and pre-feudal structures) and the capitalist and socialist formations in the socio-economic sphere, and the alliance of the victorious socialist revolution and the democratic forces of the colonial and semicolonial peoples in the political sphere.

If contemporary humanity lived under the conditions of only two formations—socialist and capitalist—the question of non-capitalist development would not have even arisen. It would have signified the full socio-economic and class polarisation of humanity, and that part of it which lived in a bourgeois society, in keeping with its inherent laws of development, would have advanced towards socialism via the socialist revolution, either peaceful or non-peaceful, and one or another form of the dictatorship of the working class. Then there would have been no historical need for a special, non-capitalist path of development, nor would it be necessary to bypass, circumvent or “leap” over capitalism, and only one thing would have to be done—to get rid of capitalism by means of socialist revolution. It goes without saying that theoretically such a situation could have existed if capitalist development in all continents and countries was even from the outset. But capitalism had never developed evenly. And imperialism augmented this unevenness turning it into a fundamental law of capitalist development. Towards the last quarter of the 20th century, after five centuries of the existence of capitalism, a considerable part of humanity still lives in pre-capitalist formations or is just beginning to effect the transition to capitalism. Feudal and pre-feudal relations and commercial and usurious capital are predominant in the countries concerned. Their peoples are very far from even thinking about an industrial revolution, although world capitalist economy has swept them into its orbit.

That accounts for the fact that one of the most important laws of capitalism—its uneven development—gives rise to the historical need and at the same time offers an historical opportunity either to bypass it completely or considerably shorten the phases of its development. We are living in an epoch when humanity is moving from capitalism to socialism, but for a considerable part of the world population it is also an epoch of transition from pre-capitalism to socialism. This has given rise to a complex problem whose solution is being achieved on the basis of an alliance between the socialist and national liberation revolutions.

* * *

Marx and Engels first advanced the scientifically grounded premise about the possible paths of the movement of the backward countries towards socialism in the period from 1845 to 1848. In *The German Ideology* and the *Principles of Communism* the thought is expressed that the victory of the socialist revolution in Europe would "also exercise considerable influence upon other countries of the world, completely changing the hitherto existing mode of their development and accelerating it greatly".*

What do the words "completely changing" mean? The complete bypassing of capitalism, or the acceleration of its development to such an extent that the appearance of the working class and its political maturity would open the way for the transition to socialism via capitalism? Marx and Engels were more inclined towards the first. Thus, a bold new route was charted, a route that would lead towards socialism more than two-thirds of the world's population, that section of it which had not even reached the stage of capitalist development but was already exploited and plundered by the emerging world capitalist economy and market. Taking these facts into account Marx and Engels had every reason to regard that the solution of the problem of bypassing the capitalist stage hinged on the external politico-economic factor. The main idea that permeated their studies was that the European socialist revolution would set the course for the backward peoples to follow. The internal factors of this route towards socialism for the backward countries remained in the background at the time, and Marx and Engels naturally did not elaborate them. They presented the question in this manner not because they were unconcerned with the future of the enslaved peoples, as is alleged by the falsifiers of Marxism who strive, whatever the cost, to prevent a rapprochement between the national liberation struggle and scientific socialism. On the contrary, the very fact that Marx and Engels viewed the liberation of colonies as an important part of the programme of socialist revolution proves that they always had the colonial problem in their field of vision and that it was

* Frederick Engels, "Principles of Communism", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 92.

absolutely clear to them that its revolutionary solution was just as inevitable as the downfall of capitalism in developed European countries.

Their specific approach to the colonial question in the 1840s was based on a comparative appraisal of the revolutionary potential of the industrialised countries and the colonies, which was fully justified and realistic at that time. In the mid-19th century a revolution was maturing in Europe and the heightened activity of the urban toiling classes created the hope that it would assume a proletarian character. At the time Africa had not yet actively entered the orbit of world politics, while in Asia the last hotbeds of the movement, which Marx after studying the Indian Mutiny, the opium wars and the peasant war of the Tai Pings in China called "feudal nationalism", were flaring up and dying down. In spite of their deep sympathies for the fighters for freedom and national dignity and particularly for the broad masses of the peasants, artisans and the urban lower classes, Marx and Engels were fully aware that these movements would be unable to withstand capitalism's economic and military onslaught, and were consequently doomed. It was still a long way to the contemporary anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist movement which is taking place within national boundaries under the guidance of historically progressive classes and merges with the socialist revolution. In the middle of the 19th century there were neither subjective nor objective conditions for this. In the opinion of the founders of scientific socialism the liberation of the colonies would be a natural historical result of the proletarian revolution in Europe, which, as they correctly believed, would precede the anti-colonial revolution.

This course of national liberation and social progress has been and still is theoretically possible; moreover, it has been confirmed in practice. It was the October Socialist Revolution which emancipated the oppressed peoples of tsarist Russia. The national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, and the victory of the USSR and the anti-Hitler coalition over German and Italian fascism and Japanese militarism led to the crisis and then to the collapse of the colonial system. All these deep-lying processes have a common foundation: the alliance of national-colonial wars and revolutions with the international communist and working-class movement and with its product—the world socialist system. The latest example of this intensive process is the disintegration of the Portuguese colonial empire. We

saw how the prolonged national-revolutionary war led to a crisis and the overthrow of Portuguese fascism by united democratic forces and this, in its turn, generated an active process of decolonisation. Here the objective factor was the interaction of the revolutionary forces in Portugal proper with the national liberation movements in her colonies, for the anti-colonial war of the African peoples played a crucial role in undermining the mainstays of the Salazar-Caetano regime.

In the mid-19th century, however, the forecast that the liberation of the colonial peoples and their movement towards socialism would take place on the basis of the fusion of their struggle with the socialist revolution in Europe failed to come true. The socialist revolution in Europe was not as close at hand as it had seemed in the early 1840s. Lenin wrote about Marx, who had drawn conclusions from the defeat of the revolution of 1848: "He had himself, in 1850, renounced his socialist illusions that a socialist revolution was impending in 1848." * It was then that Marx formulated the premise that the European revolution would have to live through 15-20 or even 50 years of civil and international wars.

Having conceded in the mid-19th century that capitalism could develop for another half a century, Marx naturally once again took up the question of the course of events on the outskirts of the capitalist society. In 1858, at the time of the first Indian Mutiny against British rule, Marx wrote to Engels: "The difficult question for us is this: on the Continent the revolution is imminent and will moreover immediately assume a socialist character. Is it not bound to be crushed in this little corner, considering that in a far greater territory the movement of bourgeois society is still in the ascendant?" **

At the end of the 1850s Marx argued in his *Capital* that world capitalism was incapable of transforming the East along capitalist lines even if the socialist revolution in Europe was retarded. This would have required a great deal of time which capitalism no longer had at the close of the 1850s, and also the spontaneous development of national capitalism proper based on internal capitalist accumulation which the Asian and African countries lacked and could not expect to have as they increasingly turned into colonies and semicolonies of European,

* V.I. Lenin, "Preface to the Russian Translation of Karl Marx's Letters to Dr. Kugelmann", *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 106.

** Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 104.

Japanese and North American capitalism and victims of the objectively increasing colonial and imperialist plunder. The capitalist world entered the epoch of imperialism, and imperialism is oppression by a handful of states of financial capital of the colonial, semicolonial and dependent countries in the first place. The export of capital, i.e. the "transplantation" of capitalist production to the colonies, did not save capitalism. It was an expansion of capitalist production with the view to exporting super-profits, i.e. yet another operation which inhibited the rapid growth and thwarted the victory of *national* capitalism in these continents.

As it happens the socialist revolution in the developed countries is not the sole factor narrowing the prospect of capitalism turning into the dominating formation in the colonial world. As a matter of fact the very relations between the colonies and the metropolitan countries prevent this from taking place. In building up their conception of the future of the colonial peoples the founders of Marxism-Leninism took into account not only the revolutionising impact of the victorious socialism, its assistance and force of example, but also the profound antagonism between the metropolitan countries and the colonies rooted among other things in the fact that the emergence of national capitalism in the colonies clashed with the interests of the European countries and that the preservation of social and economic backwardness was essential for perpetuating imperialist exploitation as a source upon which it thrived.

Marx and Engels showed that there were antagonistic contradictions not only between the socialist and capitalist formations, but also between countries standing at the pre-capitalist or early-capitalist stage of development, on the one hand, and the advanced capitalist countries which for centuries enslaved the peoples of the colonies and dependencies, on the other. Having become a system of worldwide colonial oppression, international capitalism started to conserve and even implant the pre-capitalist order in the colonial periphery. Although advantageous for Western capitalism it also signified that it itself crippled the chances for the colonial periphery to undergo a "normal" capitalist transformation.

The slow and laborious development of capitalism in the backward countries, and the imminence of a socialist revolution in Europe made it even more obvious that the *victory of socialism would determine the content of the epoch earlier than world capitalism would absorb the pre-capitalist environment and*

transform it along its own lines and in its own image. This, in turn, inevitably prompted the oppressed peoples living under the conditions of pre-capitalist formations to enter into a close political and economic alliance with socialism and thus enabled the former colonies to bypass the capitalist stage of development.

The prediction made by the founders of scientific socialism proved to be correct. The entry of capitalism into its imperialist stage wrought only one substantial change into it: as a result of the increasing unevenness of the development of capitalism in different countries, a socialist revolution won first in one country which had an average level of capitalist development and after that in a group of countries, and not simultaneously in the leading capitalist countries. Capitalism as a system, and colonialism as its offspring continued to retain fairly strong positions. This meant that the question of the former colonies bypassing capitalism would have to be resolved now in the course of a competition between capitalism and socialism in which the stand of the leaders of the enslaved countries and pre-capitalist structures had to be taken into account. It proved to be a much longer process than could have been anticipated in the mid-19th century and created greater difficulties in the way of the socialist transformation of the economically backward nations, for it had to be carried out in the course of a determined struggle against world imperialism. But it was this circumstance that consolidated the principal bulwark and guarantee of such a transformation, the alliance of the liberated peoples with the socialist countries, which was welded by an objective coincidence of interests, and oriented it on the struggle against imperialism as its new and urgent task. This opened fresh though not immediate prospects for the former colonial peoples to advance towards socialism, namely the gradual transition from the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle for national liberation, in which they relied on the socialist countries, to a struggle against capitalism in general and the introduction of socialist change, the transition whose dialectics in the new epoch were evolved by Lenin.

After they had analysed the capitalist mode of production and the colonial economy of the end of the 1850s, Marx and Engels became firmly convinced that it was not historically inevitable for all the peoples to pass through the capitalist stage when "a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the

modern powers of production, and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples".* When that takes place the capitalist form of progress will no longer be the sole path of humanity's social and scientific and technical development, and "then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain".**

They also agreed that the survivals of the collectivist patriarchal structure, the peasant commune in the first place, could be used in the interests of socialism. They studied this question mainly in connection with the possibility of a revolution taking place in Russia, and also mentioned it in their polemic against and correspondence with Russian revolutionary Narodniks.***

Engels wrote in the Afterword to his work *The Social Question in Russia*: "There is no doubt that after the victory of the proletariat and the establishment of common ownership of the means of production in the West European nations, countries which had just embarked on the path of capitalist production and where tribal customs or their survivals continue to exist so far" will be able "considerably to shorten their road to socialist society". "But this inevitably requires the example and active support of the still capitalist West. Only when the capitalist economy is surmounted in its place of origin and in countries where it is flourishing, only when the backward countries regard this as an example of 'how this is done', how to place the productive forces of the contemporary industry in the form of public property at the service of society as a whole, only then will these backward countries be able to take such a shortened road of development. But then they can be confident of success. And this applies not only to Russia, but to all countries standing at the pre-capitalist stage of development."****

Accordingly the conception of the shortened path of development for countries which had not attained the capitalist stage was based not only on the force of example of victorious socialism and its assistance, but also on the internal socio-economic,

* Karl Marx, "The Future Results of British Rule in India", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 499.

** Ibid.

*** See R. P. Konyushaya. "Karl Marx and Frederick Engels on the Possibility of a Non-Capitalist Path of Development", *Novaya i noveishaya istoria*. No. 3, 1973.

**** Marx/Engels. *Werke*, Bd. 22, Berlin, 1969, S. 427-29.

class and political conditions. The preservation of communal landownership was proclaimed as the main condition for bypassing capitalism.

Raising the question of classes which are called upon to realise the idea of non-capitalist development, Marx in the first place pointed to the pre-capitalist peasantry (patriarchal and small-commodity production) as a force capable of gradually adopting the collective forms of production and social life in the struggle against feudalism and for the ownership of the results of their labour, and of opposing the primary accumulation and capitalism as a system.

Peasants involved in patriarchal and small-commodity production are the owners of such a type of private property whose character changes "according as these private individuals [i. e. peasants—*R. U.*] are labourers or not labourers".* Here there is a differentiation between the exploiters' and the toilers' private property which gives rise to the fundamental contradictions between "two diametrically opposed economic systems".** Its dual nature makes it possible to draw patriarchal and small-commodity production peasantry into an alliance with international socialism using its revolutionary potential and also creates the possibility of its advancing in the direction of capitalism.

The peasantry's dualism has been and still is wholly responsible for its vacillations. According to Marx its inherent dualism leaves room for the alternative: either its proprietary instinct will get the better of the collectivist instinct, or vice versa. Everything depends on the historical conditions. Marx and Engels first raised the question of an alliance between the proletariat and the patriarchal peasantry in relation to Ireland in the period between 1870 and 1895. Assessing the course of events in Russia they completed the elaboration of the scientific concept of non-capitalist development. Marx believed that a revolution in England and a coup in Russia would be an essential condition for the overthrow of European capitalism. As regards Russia, Marx and Engels said that she needed a people's, democratic, agrarian, peasant social revolution and egalitarian distribution of land which would become the property of peasant land communes. They believed that Russia's patriarchal and semipatriarchal peasantry was the main motive force of the

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1975, p. 713.

** Ibid., p. 716.

revolution at the time and that if a European revolution did take place, the Russian revolution could lead to the establishment of a revolutionary dictatorship of the people, i.e. the dictatorship of the peasantry.

A people's revolution is the decisive political prerequisite for non-capitalist development. As the founders of Marxism saw it, non-capitalist development did not amount to artificially preserving the pre-capitalist forms of social existence and admiring them, but to mobilising the masses for a revolution which, being initially directed against feudal and semifeudal exploitation, would also bar the way to capitalism, and by taking advantage of age-old collectivist traditions would raise the peoples to a higher stage of historical development.

Naturally, such a turn of events cannot be brought about by good intentions or even by revolutionary enthusiasm alone. There have to be objective factors, an economic need for such a transformation and material conditions for translating it into reality. The economic need springs from internal development. As regards the material conditions, they are largely created with outside help. As Marx and Engels saw it, a proletarian revolution would give the Russian peasant the necessary conditions and material means to revolutionise the entire system of agriculture.*

Marx and Engels evolved the basic principles of the conception of non-capitalist development. Its main thesis, whose vast historical significance and revolutionising influence cannot be overestimated, is that the peasantry in the period of transition from feudalism to capitalism has an anti-capitalist potential which makes it an ally of the working class in a given country and also on an international scale. The revolutionary proletariat addresses this thesis, which overturns the biased allegations that Marxism scorned the peasantry regarding it as an inert, hostile social mass, to the peoples of the colonial world.

* * *

The new stage in the elaboration of the Marxist concept of non-capitalist development is connected with Lenin and with

* See Frederick Engels, "On Social Relations in Russia", in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 2, pp. 395-96.

the activity of the Bolshevik Party and the Communist International. The epoch ushered in by the world's first victorious socialist revolution raised the question about the future of the peoples oppressed by imperialism not only on the theoretical, but also on the practical plane, as one of the most important aspects of the world revolutionary process inalienably connected with the prospects facing socialism throughout the world. Creatively applying Marxism in the new historical conditions, Lenin paid the greatest heed to two propositions formulated by Marx and Engels concerning the colonies, namely, that it was possible for them to bypass capitalism and that an alliance between the oppressed peoples and the victorious socialist revolution was essential; on their basis he evolved an absolutely new idea concerning a *single world revolutionary process* which was directed in the first place against imperialism but which in the final count would be aimed against capitalism as a social formation.

Back in 1916 Lenin noted: "Now, as always, we stand and shall continue to stand for the closest association and merging of the class-conscious workers of the advanced countries with the workers, peasants and slaves of *all* the oppressed countries.... We shall exert every effort to foster association and merger with the Mongolians, Persians, Indians, Egyptians. We believe it is our duty and *in our interest* to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will *not be secure*." *

In a report delivered on July 26, 1920 at a meeting of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions of the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said: "The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal—in that event it will be mistaken to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development. ... With the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of de-

* V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

velopment, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage." *

In keeping with this premise of Lenin, it was written down in the programme of the Comintern that in those backward countries "where there are almost no hired workers or not at all, where the majority of the population lives under tribal conditions and where the survivals of primitive tribal formations still exist, where there is almost no national bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism is above all a military occupier intent on seizing land, the struggle for national liberation is a matter of central importance. Here a national uprising and its victory may open the road for development towards socialism without passing the capitalist stage in general, provided the countries of the proletarian dictatorship actually furnish their great practical aid." **

Underscoring the international significance of the Soviet government's policy of recognising the full equality of the national minorities, living in the non-Russian borderlands, and of extending them fraternal assistance, Lenin in the message "To the Communists of Turkestan" noted: "The attitude of the Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic to the weak and hitherto oppressed nations is of very practical significance for the whole of Asia and for all the colonies of the world, for thousands and millions of people." ***

The CPSU always followed Lenin's instructions. The 10th CPSU Congress pointed out in its resolution on the national question: "It is the Party's task to help the toiling masses of the non-Great Russian peoples to catch up with Central Russia.... As it wins the trust of the toiling masses of the eastern border regions by its vigorous and consistent struggle for the elimination of all manifestations of national inequality, the Party rallies and unites them for the final elimination of patriarchal-feudal relations in the midst of formerly oppressed nations themselves and for drawing them into communist construction." ****

* V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

** *The Communist International in Documents (1919-1932)*, Moscow, 1933, p. 30 (in Russian).

*** V. I. Lenin, "To the Communists of Turkestan", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 138.

**** *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenary Meetings*, Vol. II. Moscow, 1970, pp. 25-53 (in Russian).

The entire experience of the Soviet Union has proved that this conception which overturned the allegations of the opportunists from the Second International that the backward countries could not avoid the capitalist stage of development, was genuinely scientific and viable. In a very short period a number of republics, regions and districts with a population of over 35 million under the direct guidance and with the assistance of the working class headed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union moved to socialism from feudalism and even from earlier, pre-feudal social formations, or from underdeveloped capitalist relations dominated by feudal survivals. This took place in the Uzbek, Kazakh, Tajik, Kirghiz and Turkmen Union republics, and also in a number of autonomous republics, regions and national areas in the eastern, southern and northern parts of the USSR.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of bypassing capitalism received its practical confirmation not only in the formerly backward regions of the USSR, but also in a number of foreign countries. This theory became the guideline for the working people of all the colonies of the East which had not passed the capitalist stage of development, and was translated into reality in the Mongolian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

A particularly striking example of the implementation of Lenin's teaching about the possibility of the backward countries taking the path of non-capitalist development is offered by the Mongolian People's Republic. Addressing a meeting of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party held on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the party's Third Congress, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev said: "Your fifty years of experience constitute a major achievement in revolutionary thought and action. It was precisely here, on your soil, as in a number of Soviet Republics, that Lenin's concept of the direct transition to socialism, bypassing capitalism, became a reality. In this respect Mongolian Communists, the Mongolian people, have made a great contribution to the process of world social development."* In its transition from feudalism to socialism bypassing capitalism Mongolia relied on its political alliance and economic integration with the USSR and other countries of the world socialist community. The Mongolian People's

* L.I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 524.

Republic surmounted its age-old backwardness and turned into an agrarian-industrial country; it has attained a high level of culture and is successfully building socialism. The Republic's 50th anniversary was marked on November 26, 1974. In a report delivered on the occasion, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Y. Tsedenbal noted that in this period Mongolia had "moved from feudalism to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development".*

* * *

It is interesting to note that neither Marx, Engels nor Lenin defined the stages, periods or the rates of non-capitalist development inasmuch as they saw no real arguments in support of any conclusions on this score. They were absolutely sure that there were no prospects for capitalism in the colonial world and that the backward countries would be able to bypass capitalism only by cooperating with the victorious socialist revolution. In everything else they preferred to follow the course of events, draw lessons from history and refrain from imposing a priori speculative schemes.

Engels wrote in 1882 that one could make only futile hypotheses about the stages that the colonial countries would have to go through in their development, although they would bypass capitalism.** Lenin repeatedly noted that the movement of the peoples standing at pre-capitalist stages of development towards socialism would assume a great variety of forms. It was an issue that was by no means circumscribed by his well-known premise that each people would find its own way to socialism. The significance of this premise, which charted the national-historical perspective for the emergence of a general law of the transition to socialism in the former colonies and semicolonies, increases many times over. Each step in this direction has to have the support of the toiling, land-hungry and poor peasants making up the bulk of the population in these countries. It is necessary to orient towards socialism the great masses of down-trodden and oppressed people who had been awakened to political activity and gripped above all by a feeling of anti-imperialist nationalism and of patriotism. And these masses, as

* *Pravda*, November 27, 1974.

** See Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 331.

Lenin pointed out, would bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors.*

It was, therefore, a question of profound, fundamental features of the movement towards socialism which were unprecedented in practice and had not been theoretically substantiated. In 1919 Lenin set the progressive forces of the East the tremendously important historical task of adapting themselves to the peculiar conditions which did not exist in the European countries and of applying the general theory and practice of communism to these conditions, in which the bulk of the population were peasants.** It was necessary not only to take into consideration the different conditions in each country concerned, but also to work out principled approach to revolutionary change in each given country.

All this should be taken into account during the examination of the evolution of the idea of non-capitalist development in Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. The creative nature, the viability and soundness of this idea found their expression in that whenever the international communist movement applied it to specific and continuously changing conditions of the contemporary epoch, it generalised it and enriched it with a new substance.

Several basically different forms of non-capitalist development are already known to history: first, the bypassing of capitalism by the non-Russian peoples of the former tsarist Russia's outskirts under the dictatorship of the proletariat; second, the bypassing of capitalism under the people's democratic rule in the Mongolian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; third, the desire to bypass capitalism manifested by some Afro-Asian countries in the 1960s and 1970s. As regards these countries the international communist movement once again (in 1960) turned to the concept of non-capitalist development, by advancing the idea of a state of national democracy. This caused Soviet historians to embark on a long discussion over the question whether the formerly oppressed peoples of tsarist Russia, Mongolia and other countries which became socialist had actually advanced along the non-capitalist path.

* See V.I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 356.

** See V.I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

There is no doubt that they had in fact bypassed capitalism and took the non-capitalist path in the broad sense of this concept under the direct state assistance of the dictatorship of the working class in the USSR. The contemporary non-capitalist development of the peoples in some of the Asian and African countries differs in many respects from the experience of the peoples of the USSR and of the Mongolian People's Republic. Its main distinguishing features are that the victorious socialist revolution and the world socialist system have no direct influence on the socialist-oriented Afro-Asian countries, as was the case in the previous examples of non-capitalist development, and also that, as a rule, non-capitalist development in the Afro-Asian countries is not guided by Marxist-Leninist parties, although their ideological and political influence in some of them has increased considerably.

These features of contemporary non-capitalist development greatly augment the danger, which objectively springs from the backward socio-economic basis and class structure of the former colonies and semicolonies, that they might deviate from the road to socialism. In these countries the process of surmounting the prejudices, reactionary fantasies, weaknesses and errors of the petty-bourgeois masses which Lenin had mentioned, and of overcoming bourgeois nationalism (which he regarded as historically justified under these conditions) is guided by petty-bourgeois radicals, revolutionary nationalists and democrats who are prone to vacillation owing to their contradictory class nature, and not by Marxist-Leninist parties. It is a complicated and uneven process in which the possibility of two trends of development stemming from the dual nature of the peasant, the artisan and the semiproletarian which was so vividly disclosed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, always exists. Rooted as it is in economic conditions, this struggle comprises the main content of public life in countries advancing along the non-capitalist road.

There is a possibility that a former colony may take the capitalist road owing to the organic ties between the former colonies and dependencies and the world capitalist market, and to the dual nature of the small producer who is simultaneously a labourer and a petty proprietor. It takes a whole historical epoch to overcome the dual nature of the small producer and that constitutes the biggest difficulty in the movement of countries with a low or medium level of economic development towards socialism. The difficulty lies not only in that it is necessary

to counter bourgeois influence and the ideological offensive against the forces guiding the movement towards socialism, but also in that the long process of the transformation of small-commodity production is accompanied by the rise and growth of capitalist elements in spite of the fact that they are held in check by communal, collective or state ownership of the basic means of production and also by the national-democratic system itself.

Typical of most Afro-Asian countries are the low level of labour productivity, the superficial, inadequate division and socialisation of labour, the huge preponderance of small-scale manual production, underdeveloped exchange and, consequently, the domination of relations characteristic of a primitive, patriarchal and subsistence economy which, in the final analysis, are subject to national, and through it, to world capitalism. Alongside patriarchal relations and the natural form of exchange, the economies of these countries have an inherent tendency towards the disintegration of the natural economy and its replacement by a simple commodity economy, the latter in its turn tending to develop into capitalist commodity production whose gradual ousting, as a result of the cooperation of small producers and the reorganisation of the material and technical base, is what in fact constitutes the main content of non-capitalist development. And this requires decades.

Non-capitalist transformations in Asian and African countries have entered their general democratic phase. It is a phase when it is of primary economic importance for the bulk of the population, i.e. the toiling peasantry, gradually to modify the nature of the relations of exchange at a stage when the product of labour is exchanged for the purpose of its direct consumption and to shift from unorganised and spontaneous exchange to organised exchange, in other words from the preponderance of private trade to cooperative and state trade. Organised exchange strengthens small-scale or communal production and, at the same time, consolidates the class of the toiling peasantry; in the main it prevents its mass ruin and disintegration, and consequently, the growth of capitalist elements.

The consolidation of the class of the toiling peasantry and the improvement of its condition in a national democracy is an important aspect of non-capitalist development at the general democratic phase of the revolution. Organised exchange as a form of distribution of products of labour via the market

plays a crucial role in ousting the parasitical trade and usurious capital which vigorously opposes the transformation of natural economy into commodity economy and inhibits the social division of labour. Usurious capital, as Marx noted, "develops that much more in a given country, the more the main body of production is limited to natural services",* i.e. the lower the level of a country's economic development, the less developed is the social division of labour which is the foundation of commodity exchange.

A radical reorganisation of production relations in agriculture is still a matter of a relatively distant future. This means that the contradiction inherent in the nature of the peasantry has not yet been resolved in favour of socialism and that it is still the source of the vacillations of the petty-bourgeois leadership.

Marxists-Leninists have every confidence in the non-capitalist prospect. But their confidence bears no resemblance to the benevolent, politically dangerous and theoretically unsound efforts to adapt non-capitalist development to the existing models of national liberation revolutions growing over into socialist ones, to identify this growth with socialist reorganisation and thus portray national democrats as confirmed adherents of scientific socialism. Their confidence is based on a sober approach to reality, on the realisation of the need to wage a long and determined struggle for the genuinely socialist ideal and on the fact that they take into consideration the vast difficulties which have to be surmounted in the process of overcoming the backwardness inherited from the colonial epoch.

* * *

In 1928 the Sixth Congress of the Comintern adopted a programme which presented an original interpretation, based on an historical prognosis, of the possibility of bypassing capitalism "as a dominating system": "Given the existence of centres of socialism in the person of Soviet republics and their increasing economic might, the colonies which break away from imperialism draw closer economically and gradually unite with the industrial seats of world socialism, launch socialist con-

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1975, p. 610.

struction bypassing the phase of the further development of capitalism as a dominating system, and thus find themselves in a position to embark upon speedy economic and cultural progress.”*

What was original in such a presentation of the question? First, the programme envisaged a very long historical process of economic rapprochement on the basis of close political positions, and of the unification of economic efforts, i.e. of economic integration of the agrarian countries (former colonies) with the “industrial seats of world socialism”.

Second, according to this document the economic drawing together and unification implied the gradual growth of elements of integration, i.e. cooperation of production and the transition from the all-round development of commodity exchange and technical cooperation in the construction of enterprises and the infrastructure, to such a social division of labour which would reflect cooperation, production and exchange based on equitable international economic relations.

Third, it is this process of the economic integration of the socialist countries and countries which liberated themselves from colonial dependence that would enable the latter to embark upon socialist construction thus creating the decisive condition for the termination of capitalist development and making the social progress irreversible.

This premise in the further elaboration of the Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development is just as relevant today as it was in 1928, when it was formulated.

A close rapprochement in the economic field between the socialist and the liberated countries has been going on in the past decade under the decisive influence of the Soviet Union and the world socialist system. Conditions which are gradually emerging not only in the field of commodity exchange but also directly in the area of production are paving the way for the forthcoming economic integration of these countries. Therefore Leonid Brezhnev had every reason to say: “Today we have good relations, which are based on mutual trust and respect, with the young national states. The extent and the concrete forms of these friendly relations depend on the general political

* *The Communist International in Documents* (1919-1932), p. 31 (in Russian).

course which a particular state pursues. We have closer economic and political ties, closer relations with countries which in their development are heading towards socialism.”*

Indeed, more than 850 industrial and other projects have already been built or are under construction with Soviet assistance in Asian, African and Latin American countries. All in all the CMEA member-countries have helped in the construction of more than 2,000 projects, 70 per cent of which have already been commissioned, in 63 developing countries.

The massive economic integration of the CMEA member-countries will evidently have an ever increasing impact on the liberated countries which want to break away from capitalism and build socialism. This will inaugurate a qualitatively new phase in the non-capitalist development of the Eastern countries at which they will concentrate on overcoming their backwardness at an accelerated pace and improving living conditions on the basis of a major breakthrough in the development of the productive forces; non-capitalist development will become irreversible and will be oriented on socialist construction by means of the gradual inclusion of all aspects of life in the liberated countries into this effort.

The national liberation movement acquires an increasingly anti-capitalist content. In the foreseeable future the economic rapprochement of the socialist and the non-capitalist liberated countries will augment the anti-capitalist content of the national liberation movement. It is this content that will determine the economic policy of the non-capitalist countries, and this, in turn, will bring these countries firmly onto the road of socialist construction.

What Marx and Engels regarded in the mid-19th century as a remote and fairly indefinite prospect is a palpable reality of world historic importance in the last quarter of the 20th century. Obviously this is a major achievement of Marxist-Leninist theory, manifesting the latter's profound scientific viability, and shows how theory is translated into practice and, conversely, how practice influences and enriches theory.

In their time the founders of Marxism-Leninism were greatly concerned about the destiny of the vast majority of mankind living in the backward countries when socialism triumphs in Europe or in some of its industrialised countries. Today it can

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 56.

be safely said that historically this problem is being solved in favour of scientific socialism and the broadest masses in the liberated countries which have set themselves the task of building a socialist society in the long term.

A new conclusive formula of the conception of non-capitalist development was evolved by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow which called it a special form of progressive social development: "Under the impact of the revolutionary conditions of our time distinctive forms of progressive social development of the newly free countries have appeared, and the role of revolutionary and democratic forces has been enhanced. Some young states have taken the non-capitalist path, a path which opens up the possibility of overcoming the backwardness inherited from the colonial past and creates conditions for transition to socialist development." *

It follows that the non-capitalist path is not to be identified with socialist development in the full sense of the word: it is a period when the material, social and cultural conditions of transition to socialist development are created. This means that it is a pre-socialist stage at which a revolutionary-democratic state orients itself towards socialism at the democratic, i.e. the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal phase of the revolution. Such a formula, reflecting as it does the qualitatively different phases of the revolution, is necessary because it supports and accentuates the social progress of non-capitalist development and defines its socialist perspective, on the one hand, and neither confuses nor identifies the latter with socialism, on the other.

This question was also examined in the report delivered at the 24th CPSU Congress by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev. Stressing that non-capitalist development of the liberated countries is spearheaded against all forms of exploitation existing there, he said: "The main thing is that *the struggle for national liberation in many countries has in practical terms begun to grow into a struggle against exploitative relations, both feudal and capitalist.*

"Today, there are already quite a few countries in Asia and Africa which have taken the non-capitalist way of development,

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 28.*

that is, the path of building a socialist society in the long term. Many states have now taken this path. Deep-going social changes, which are in the interests of the masses of people, and which lead to a strengthening of national independence, are being implemented in these countries, and the number of these changes has been growing as time goes on.”*

It would be opportune to note here that, as Lenin had scientifically predicted in his time, capitalism is also becoming the target of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle.

* 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1971, pp. 23-24.

The Significance of the Solution of the National Question in the USSR for the Developing Countries

The truly exceptional role played by Lenin's ideas in the transformation of the world on the basis of freedom, equality and social justice becomes more and more manifest as the world revolutionary process gains in scope and scale and assumes a diversity of forms, and the front of the global struggle against the forces of imperialism, racism and reaction becomes increasingly broader. Lenin's ideas have been embodied in the revolutionary practice of the CPSU and the Soviet state. They have become an historical reality and this amplifies their revolutionary impact.

Since its formation the Soviet state has been the main contributor to the cause of world revolution and the national liberation of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It was in this period that a deep-going transformation of the world, i.e. the deposal of capitalism and a revolutionary transition to the socialist formation, got under way, and the colonial political domination of imperialism in a larger part of the world was abolished. The Soviet people played an outstanding role in this revolutionary process whose organising and inspiring force was the Leninist Party which established firm links first with the colonies and dependencies and then, after the rout of Hitler Germany and militarist Japan, with the peoples who freed themselves from colonial oppression.

The Soviet Union has gained vast experience in the socio-economic and political transformation of the world. It includes boldly-conceived original decisions in achieving the strategic

objectives of the revolution, in applying distinctive tactical methods and forms, in reorganising political, social, economic and cultural life, in combating imperialist ideology, in defending the revolution arms in hand and routing its enemies, and in organising an offensive against imperialism along the entire front on the basis of an alliance with all revolutionary forces. It is most important that this experience is available to all and is not imposed on anybody. Any democrat, anti-imperialist, anti-racist, national-revolutionary or socialist, irrespective of race or nationality, can draw on everything that is useful to him in this storehouse of experience and put it to practical use in life and struggle in keeping with the historical, social, cultural and national conditions in his country.

The CPSU and the Soviet state have always worked for the establishment of the closest possible alliance with all national liberation movements and national-colonial revolutions, making the forms of their influence consistent with the level of the development of the revolutionary-democratic, working-class and communist movement of the fighting nations, the toiling people in each given country and their national and class awareness. There is not a single genuinely mass popular liberation movement, either peaceful or armed, which does not have the support of the Leninist Party.

Imperialist strategy is designed to prevent the liberation of peoples who have rallied for the struggle, forestall their active participation in international affairs, hold them within the world system of capitalism, guide their socio-economic development towards capitalism, thwart their efforts to win economic independence after securing political independence and make it impossible for the liberated countries to form an alliance with socialism.

It is the policy of the Soviet state to assist the peoples' struggle for independence in every possible way, help the young national states to achieve economic independence, build up their national economy, master modern equipment, train national scientific and technical personnel and generously share with the peoples of the liberated countries its experience in solving complex political, economic and ideological problems.

Owing to a range of fundamentally important circumstances, Lenin's teaching and the Soviet experience are particularly valuable to the proponents of national liberation and independent progressive development in Asian and African countries.

Lenin understood the international significance and inter-connection of all the components of the revolutionary movement; he advanced an extremely bold idea, permeated by the dialectics of the class and national liberation struggle, that of a single world revolutionary process, all of whose complex and at times contradictory components—general democratic, national liberation and social—were intertwined and supported each other. He told the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East: “The socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism.”*

Lenin did not visualise the national liberation revolution in isolation from the socialist revolution; he maintained that only the socialist revolution would be able to put an end to imperialism as a world system. His internationalism was so boundless, profound and concrete that he resolutely rejected the concept of socialist revolution as being nothing more than a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie. He held that the socialist revolution was inseparable from the struggle of all peoples oppressed by imperialism, of all dependent countries against international imperialism. This broad even universal concept of world socialist revolution was absolutely original. He was the first to approach the question from such a point of view and to evolve the concrete principles and tactics of the interaction of the international struggle of the proletariat and the struggle of the oppressed countries and peoples.

Displaying acute mental vision Lenin noted the immense revolutionising impact of the socialist changes in Europe on the course of the national liberation movement. He pointed out in his *A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism* written in 1916 that the liberation of the colonies was “realisable in conjunction with a socialist revolution in Europe”.** In a report to the Second Congress of the Comintern (1920) he formulated the idea that the triumphant socialist revolution had to defend

* V.I. Lenin, “Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

** V.I. Lenin, “A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 66.

the interests of national liberation movements. "We in Russia are often obliged to compromise, to bide our time," he said, "since we are weaker than the international imperialists, yet we know that we are defending the interests of this mass of a thousand and a quarter million people [of colonial and dependent countries — *R. U.*]."*

The Leninist tenet that it is necessary to defend the interests of the peoples who are oppressed by and dependent on imperialism has always been and will continue to be one of the guiding principles of Soviet foreign policy. The economic, political and military might of the USSR and other socialist countries and their enhanced international prestige check neocolonialist expansion and protect the young national states of the East against imperialist encroachments. When such encroachments develop into interventions, into protracted local aggressive and anti-popular wars, imperialism is unable to achieve a military victory over the liberated and fighting nations which are supported by the USSR and the socialist community as was the case in Algeria, Cuba, Vietnam and in the Arab East.

At the same time Lenin believed that a rapprochement between European socialism and the national liberation movement and the merger of their interests in the common struggle against world imperialism also strengthened the positions of socialism. "We shall endeavour to render these nations, more backward and oppressed than we are, 'disinterested cultural assistance', to borrow the happy expression of the Polish Social-Democrats," he wrote. "In other words, we will help them pass to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism."** The issue, therefore, is the coincidence of "the fundamental interests of all peoples suffering from the yoke of imperialism"***. This objective coincidence of interests, however, by no means disposes of the need for deliberate effort aimed at fostering mutual understanding and fruitful cooperation. "Complete victory over capitalism," Lenin wrote, "cannot be won unless the proletariat and, following it, the mass of working people in all countries and nations throughout the world voluntarily strive for

* V.I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 233.

** V.I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

*** V.I. Lenin, "The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 491.

alliance and unity.”* And today, too, these words summon all progressive, anti-imperialist forces to strengthen their unity and solidarity.

Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders denied all rights to the colonial peoples. They treated them with the cynical arrogance of chauvinists who had betrayed proletarian internationalism and were driving the backward colonial peoples into the arms of capitalism. But Lenin, anticipating the victory of socialism in Russia and in Europe, was mainly concerned with bringing together the politically aware European proletarian and the colonial slave and securing their “merger” in order to provide socialism in Europe with a firm basis, and then use this socialism to help the colonial slaves to cast off imperialist oppression and advance towards democracy and socialism. The interaction of these two main forces of the world revolutionary movement stands out with particular clarity. The unity of the main revolutionary forces, according to Lenin, had to be free of even the slightest hint at arrogance or condescension: it had to rest on pure and unsullied proletarian internationalism which was expressed in the convergence and merger of the anti-imperialist forces, the obligation of the advanced to assist the backward and the coincidence of the fundamental interests of all peoples.

Anti-Communists and anti-Soviet elements in general viciously attack Lenin’s programme for the solution of the national question and its implementation in the USSR. They strive to prove that because of its internationalist nature Marxism-Leninism, scientific socialism, allegedly ignores national interests, sacrifices them at the altar of social progress and the revolution; they claim that Marxism-Leninism on the whole is opposed to patriotism and any national movement. Not surprisingly, such theses are put forward by imperialist propaganda. It is to be regretted that occasionally they are picked up by some myopic representatives of contemporary national movements, thus weakening the anti-imperialist front, and some of them even say that scientific socialism is aimed against national patriotic forces. On their part the Communists maintain that such a presentation of the question is dogmatic and erroneous. It merely plays into the hands of the forces which are intent on undermining the firm alliance, which came into being in the first years after the October Revolution, between

* V. I. Lenin, “Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 151.

socialism and the national liberation movement, weakening the genuinely socialist trends in the Liberated countries and strengthening the positions of landlord-bourgeois nationalist and chauvinist elements that, moreover, are inclined to come to terms with imperialism. Lenin never expounded the difference between socialism and nationalism from abstract or dogmatic positions. "An abstract presentation of the question of nationalism in general is of no use at all," he wrote. "A distinction must necessarily be made between the nationalism of an oppressor nation and that of an oppressed nation, the nationalism of a big nation and that of a small nation." *

Scientific socialism reckons with the fact that for many liberated countries anti-imperialist nationalism with its inherent contradictions and parochialism, its desire to isolate itself and assert its exclusiveness now constitutes a definite phase of development inasmuch as not all national objectives have been achieved so far. But in each given case it is necessary to draw a clear distinction between national and nationalistic, patriotic and chauvinistic, democratic and conservative and reactionary, anti-imperialist, anti-racist and pro-imperialist, racist aims. Some nations still have to win state independence, while more than 90 other states of the contemporary world are involved in a bitter struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism in order to strengthen their newly-won political independence, achieve economic independence, overcome backwardness and enhance living and cultural standards. Scientific socialism cannot make any concessions in matters of principle to the ideology of nationalism. It does, however, take into account that anti-imperialist nationalism has become firmly ingrained in the consciousness of the peoples of the former colonies whose lives and dignity had been trampled upon for decades and even centuries by foreign exploiters.

Marxists-Leninists fully understand and take into account the prejudices, reactionary fantasies and errors that are unavoidable when the national is absolutised and when rabid nationalism which rules out the unity of different peoples in the struggle against imperialism is preached, and resolutely fight against them. Marxists-Leninists have always urged mutual understanding and alliance between socialism and anti-imperialist patriotism in the common anti-imperialist struggle and never

* V. I. Lenin, "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 607.

contraposed socialism to the national feelings of the formerly oppressed colonial peoples. Some national revolutionaries want to isolate the national liberation movement from socialism, while right-wing nationalists are inclined to come to terms with neocolonialism. Their intention is to cut off the national liberation revolutions from the international experience of the anti-imperialist struggle and socialist construction, hoping that in the event of the success of their tactic as opposed to the tactic of the alliance of all anti-imperialist forces, it will be less difficult for them to decelerate the spread of the national revolution, prevent it from turning into a social revolution and either remove the gradually forming revolutionary leadership or prevent it from coming to power.

Leninism is consonant with the national liberation movement because it has confidence in the revolutionary and creative potential of mass movements, in their ability with the support of the victorious socialist revolution not only to put an end to the domination of imperialism but also to tackle the difficult task of paving the way towards socialism. The liberated countries know very well that Leninism is distinguished by its remarkable ability to perceive every new opportunity for social progress, to appreciate the peculiarities of historical development and national traditions in the former colonies and, consequently, to take cognisance of new methods and ways of solving the common task of effecting the transition to socialism.

Lenin did not believe that the alliance between socialism and the anti-imperialist movement of the oppressed nations was confined exclusively to the anti-imperialist struggle, and opened before it broader prospects of joint struggle, mutual trust and enrichment with revolutionary experience. He pointed out that the foremost representatives of the national-revolutionary movement will turn to socialism which in turn requires continuous support for the revolutionary, democratic aspirations of the national movements. Formulating his theory and tactics, Lenin considered the fact that reliance on the victorious socialist revolution in the advanced countries would enable the former colonial peoples to bypass capitalism. The implementation of the strategy of transition to socialism along the non-capitalist path depends on the establishment of a united front and of a long and firm alliance between the proponents of scientific socialism and representatives of the national liberation movement.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always main-

tained close political contacts with national-revolutionaries in the Arab East, the Far East, South and Southeast Asia, Tropical Africa, Latin America and in other parts of the world.

Within the framework of his immortal theory of socialist revolution in which he propounded the ways and forms of the transition of the whole of humankind from capitalism to socialism, Lenin also evolved a conception which made it clear that the peoples who were liberating themselves from imperialist domination had a tangible opportunity to advance along the non-capitalist road and that there were new paths leading to socialism for countries lagging behind in economic development. The essence of this conception was that it was possible to move towards socialism not through capitalism as in Europe and America, but either bypassing it altogether or curtailing its advanced phases, those of industrial and monopoly capitalism.

Non-capitalist development is a path which can lead to socialism those peoples and countries which are standing at the pre-capitalist stage or are moving towards capitalism and which have a weak and numerically small working class. The struggle going on in these countries is directed mainly against outside imperialist interference and the survivals of the pre-capitalist and of the feudal order, and not only against "its own" capitalism, which has not yet completely taken shape. Its purpose is to overcome backwardness without, however, permitting capitalism to develop into a dominating economic structure and without letting the bourgeoisie turn into a dominating political force, and to make it possible for the country to change its course of development and eventually advance towards socialism. This means that non-capitalist development entails a combination of tasks which are set by the general democratic and the socialist revolution. In its initial stages priority will inevitably be given to the achievement of general democratic transformations, but their translation into reality gradually strengthens trends that are consistently anti-capitalist and pro-socialist. "It is perfectly clear," Lenin told the Third Congress of the Comintern, "that in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, *will turn against capitalism* and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect."* [Italics are mine — R. U.]

* V. I. Lenin, "The Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 482.

Non-capitalist development is a complex phenomenon characterised by a very long coexistence of contradictory tendencies, some of which, far from being consistently socialist, even run counter to socialist principles. But this is precisely what distinguishes it from the direct path to socialism: the purpose of non-capitalist development is gradually to bring the productive forces and the peoples of the backward countries to socialism in spite of the fact that due to objective reasons they have not yet reached the stage at which they would be ready to launch direct socialist construction. In view of their *present level of development* these countries can surmount their internal contradictions only by preparing the masses for socialism and gradually guiding them towards it.

Hence the danger of the pseudo-revolutionary attempts to "leap over" the masses' level of development, which is determined by socio-economic factors, and, as is the case in some national-democratic states, relying on the executive apparatus, often a military one, that on the surface functions as a vanguard but lacks the support of the broad masses, to begin directly and immediately to implement socialist principles forgetful that this process has to be conducted with circumspection and caution and has to be preceded by an intermediate stage. Lenin warned against such delusions. He said that the vanguard could not accomplish the transition to communism by itself and that the task was to arouse the working masses to revolutionary activity and to independent action, regardless of the level they had reached.*

The bulk of the population in the liberated states consists of the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeois strata steeped in nationalist feelings. Addressing representatives of the Eastern peoples Lenin said: "You will have to base yourselves on the bourgeois nationalism which is awakening, and must awaken, among those peoples, and which has its historical justification."** Lenin made the point that a "pure" social revolution was impossible. This particularly applies to the former colonies and to non-capitalist development, and is just as correct as Lenin's characterisation of the role of the petty-bourgeois masses in the revolution who, he said, will "bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their

* V. I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

** Ibid.

weaknesses and errors. But *objectively* they will attack *capital...*" * His assertion that "objectively they will attack capital" is very important. Its theoretical, political and strategic significance is fundamental and independent, for it contains a real prospect of an offensive on capital, both local and foreign, and consequently, the possibility of the elimination of capital by the forces of the developing and deepening national liberation revolution that inspires workers and peasants to action.

There was not even a hint of dogmatic, pseudo-proletarian arrogance and contempt in Lenin's attitude to the democratic aspirations of social groups and political leaders whose positions were far removed from scientific socialism. On the contrary, he supported everything in their ideological and political platform that brought them closer to democracy and socialism, that objectively or subjectively helped society to move in this direction. He thought it necessary to use their revolutionary potential, no matter how small, and to guide the intermediate, vacillating elements towards socialism and not push them away and isolate them from it.

Marxism-Leninism has never rejected any other ideological trends and social theories, particularly in the East, out of hand, simply because they were not Marxist. These social theories which in the East are manifest in specific, revolutionary as well as reformist and even religious forms, may have (and frequently do have) democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist elements. And it is up to the Marxists to tackle the difficult and extremely important task of ascertaining their true class content, immediate and ultimate aims, objective roots and revolutionary nature, and the possibility of forming an alliance with them. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party assessed the activity and the role of Sun Yat-sen, Mahatma Gandhi, Kemal Atatürk and Amanullah Khan precisely from such positions. By doing so they set an example of the unity of the tactic of "infighting" against imperialism and the "setting of the sights" for a socialist revolution in the East. The CPSU takes all this into account in defining its attitude to Jawaharlal Nehru, Gamal Abdel Nasser and Sukarno and also to the living revolutionary leaders who not without setbacks guided and continue to guide the peoples of their countries in the struggle against imperialism; and that is the most important thing which enables the socialist com-

* V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 356.

munity and the national liberation movement jointly to act against the common enemy.

A searching analysis of the structure of the contemporary national liberation movements brings to light the role played by the lower social strata: the petty bourgeoisie, the urban poor, the artisans, the peasantry and also the democratic elements in the armed forces which push the affluent national bourgeoisie into the background and sometimes assume the leadership of the movement in the country. This is not surprising if it is taken into account that in spite of the fact that the role played by the working class, and in some countries by the Marxist-Leninist parties, has enhanced, there are no Asian and African states — outside the world socialist system — where they are in power, although in some of them they do participate in the ruling coalition.

In the Soviet Union all major socio-economic and political problems during the period of transition to socialism were solved under the guidance of the working class and the Marxist-Leninist Party. Led by the working class the entire Soviet people, including the peasantry, the petty-bourgeois sections in town and country, and the intelligentsia which were burdened with the survivals of capitalism and sometimes even feudalism and tribal relations, created the material and technical foundations of socialism within 15 years after the October Revolution, i.e. approximately in the early 1930s.

The ideologues of imperialism and reactionary nationalism in the contemporary East repudiate the international significance of the Soviet experience. They assert that the so-called middle strata in the countries of the East are implacably hostile to scientific socialism and proletarian leadership. It is true that the middle sections of the population in many Asian and African countries are wary of the revolutionary proletariat and Marxist-Leninist parties chiefly because they are numerically small and in many cases are not fully formed. Yet, judging by the experience of the CPSU, which is of vast international importance in solving the national, agrarian and peasant questions, in carrying through industrialisation and cooperation and dealing with other complex problems, petty-bourgeois elements, to quote Lenin, "are not by any means necessarily hostile to socialism under all conditions, or in all countries".* The

* V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R. C. P. (B.)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 148.

contemporary development of the liberated countries abundantly confirms this. In the long run the efforts of the enemies of scientific socialism to incite the so-called middle, or intermediate sections of the population against the petty bourgeoisie are bound to fall through.

Besides the unification of all progressive-minded elements of the nation in the struggle against imperialism, a correct internal alignment of class forces depends on a differentiated approach to them: it is necessary to take into account their different attitude to the general democratic change and the socialist perspective. Lenin wrote in 1912: "China's freedom was won by an alliance of peasant democrats and the liberal bourgeoisie. Whether the peasants, who are not led by a proletarian party, will be able to retain their democratic positions *against* the liberals, who are only waiting for an opportunity to shift to the right, will be seen in the near future."* Clearly these words express the dilemma which still confronts many liberated countries, where a struggle is taking place between a revolutionary, plebeian, peasant trend, i.e. a popular trend which is also anti-capitalist to some extent, and a conciliatory, liberal-bourgeois trend. The practicability of the socialist prospect in countries whose peoples in the person of their leading fighters are endeavouring to break away from capitalism in their development depends on the ability to draw a line between these two trends, to support the first and isolate the second.

Under these extremely complicated conditions history compels the revolutionary parties and leaders of the national democracy in power in the developing countries which are intent on breaking loose from capitalism, to evolve a correct policy which would find its expression in a consistent struggle against imperialism, loyalty to the interests of the working people and socialist ideals, and a staunch alliance with the socialist community. The successful non-capitalist development of the newly-independent states of the East largely depends on a mature political leadership and a well-defined, correct political course. In many respects the setbacks suffered by Ghana and Mali were due to serious deviations from this course and the slackening of vigilance against the manoeuvres of the imperialists and the subversive activities of pro-Western and pro-Peking elements.

The consolidation of national independence in the economic

* V. I. Lenin, "Regenerated China", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 401.

and political fields is the principal feature of the present stage of non-capitalist development, and therefore it is very important to carry on a consistent struggle against imperialism, the main enemy. Sometimes, with the proclamation of independence there appear illusions that there are "good, cultured", so to say, "tolerable" colonialists; hopes are expressed that there can be "mutually beneficial cooperation" with imperialism, that contradictions between the former colonies and their metropolitan countries could be smoothed out at least to some degree, and so forth. The illusions about "kind colonialists" is a grievous malaise which afflicts the national-revolutionaries. The emergence and cultivation of these false notions create a loophole for neocolonialism. Lenin anticipated this danger and emphasised that it was necessary to warn people against it. It continues to exist in many countries of Tropical Africa, the Arab East, Southeast Asia and Latin America where neocolonialists are spreading their nets with the utmost determination.

Lenin indicated that there were different forms of dependence, and that it was possible to create states which only seemed to be independent. "Colonial policies and imperialism," he wrote, "are not unsound but curable disorders of capitalism... they are an inevitable consequence of the very foundations of capitalism." * He also made the following observation in his book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*: "The questions as to whether it is possible to reform the basis of imperialism, whether to go forward to the further intensification and deepening of the antagonisms which it engenders, or backward, towards allaying these antagonisms, are fundamental questions in the critique of imperialism." ** Indeed, this is still the watershed between a revolutionary approach to the question of struggling to win and uphold national independence and to repulse imperialism, and a reformist, essentially defeatist approach to this issue. Although direct political domination of imperialism has been abolished in the liberated countries, the danger of imperialism establishing indirect domination through the system of neocolonialism, making them militarily, economically and financially dependent, continues to exist and is even increasing in some countries and regions. A fairly large group of countries has already fallen or is falling into neoco-

* V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism and Socialism in Italy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 358.

** V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 287.

lonialist dependence, and some representatives of their ruling circles are surrendering their sovereign and independent positions and going hat in hand to imperialism. The appearance of such trends in a number of Arab and African countries of late has created considerable difficulties in working out a settlement in the Middle East and South Africa.

It is clear from the experience of recent years that in order to be able to stand up to imperialism and reaction it is necessary to struggle consistently against them, and this calls for unshakeable solidarity and cooperation with the socialist countries and with the working class of the capitalist states. "The international proletariat," Lenin stressed, "is the only ally of all the hundreds of millions of the working and exploited peoples of the East."*

* * *

The creative application of scientific socialism is gaining increasing recognition in the life and anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the East. The fact that large group of national-democratic states of the non-capitalist type has come into being fully confirms Lenin's idea of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the people which embraces all the toiling sections of the population, including the emergent working class, and relies on the peasantry, the largest class of toilers in these countries.

Superficial critics of Leninism fallaciously assert that it advises the Asian and African peoples immediately to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Isn't it necessary first to create a proletariat and only then establish its dictatorship?" they exclaim in an effort to refute Leninism. Actually, however, Lenin and Leninism have never recommended the peoples who were casting off colonial dependence to begin with the direct and immediate establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He repeatedly underlined that in the backward countries of the East the question was that of establishing a popular, peasant rule and not an exclusively proletarian rule.** Addressing the Second Congress of the Comintern he said: "One of the

* V.I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

** Ibid., p. 161.

most important tasks now confronting us is to consider how the foundation-stone of the organisation of the Soviet movement can be laid in the *non*-capitalist countries. Soviets are possible there; they will not be workers' Soviets, but peasants' Soviets, or Soviets of working people." * To substantiate the importance of the alliance between workers and peasants Lenin referred to the Russian revolution. He regarded this alliance as essential for the revolutionary development of the Eastern countries. "It was because the peasants and workers united against capitalism and feudalism that our victory was so easy," he stressed. "Here contact with the peoples of the East is particularly important, because the majority of the Eastern peoples are typical representatives of the working people — not workers who have passed through the school of capitalist factories, but typical representatives of the working and exploited peasant masses who are victims of medieval oppression." **

A correct political line means that decision-making in the sphere of socio-economic development should be based on a scientific analysis of the alignment of class forces. In this respect the experience of socialist changes accumulated in the USSR and other socialist countries is most valuable. Of course, it has to be studied to ensure its creative assimilation; such is the elementary requirement of dialectics, the essence of Marxism-Leninism. This experience is valuable not only because there are general laws of revolutionary development, but also because there was much in Russia which in principle was similar to the conditions and tasks facing the liberated countries today. Lenin knew that this would be so. "Geographically, economically and historically, Russia belongs not only to Europe, but also to Asia," he wrote. ***

Russia was the first to open new paths for the liberation revolution in the East. The experience of revolutionary transformations carried out in the former tsarist colonies, in such backward regions as Turkestan where pre-capitalist conditions in those days differed little from those in some contemporary Afro-Asian countries, for the first time in history proved that it

* V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", Vol. 31, pp. 232-33.

** V. I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

*** V. I. Lenin, "Lecture on the 1905 Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 251.

was both correct and feasible to promote non-capitalist development within the framework of the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat. This experience also showed that it was possible, as Lenin said, "to inspire in the masses an urge for independent political thinking and independent political action, even where a proletariat is practically non-existent".* It follows, therefore, that in Lenin's opinion the Soviet experience of non-capitalist construction in social, economic and cultural spheres was also within the reach of, and could be applied in, countries where a proletariat was "practically non-existent" but where this fact was compensated by independent political awareness and activity of the broad masses. That explains why practical experience gained following the October Revolution—the New Economic Policy which was introduced by the Soviet government, the water, land and social and cultural reforms and the ensuing socialist construction in the USSR, particularly the establishment of an independent national economy and the conversion of agriculture to cooperative rails—is of such lasting significance for the developing countries.

By drawing on Leninism and the experience of the USSR the young national states are in a position to designate the immediate tasks and evolve methods for carrying out social transformations. Indeed, they are faced with a multitude of problems that are basically similar to those which the Soviet Union had had to solve. First and foremost it is necessary to set up a new, socialist and genuinely people's state, create a new apparatus of state administration in the centre and in the localities which would be indissolubly linked with the working people, raise a revolutionary people's army and form organs of socialist law and order. A new attitude to labour and socialist property has to be cultivated, and an independent and advanced economy has to be built on the basis of industrialisation and effective economic management. It is also important to carry out the social and technical reconstruction of agriculture on the basis of a consistent agrarian revolution (the land and water reform in Soviet Central Asia, for example) and the nationalisation of land, forests and water resources, to implement Lenin's cooperative plan envisaging the gradual and phased cooperation of peasants and artisans—from the primary types of consumer,

* V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 243.

supply, producer and marketing cooperatives to collective production associations of peasants for land cultivation, cattle-breeding, fishing, trapping and hunting, and handicrafts. Another essential task is the liquidation of illiteracy and consummation of a genuinely cultural revolution which will involve the introduction of universal, compulsory primary and incomplete secondary and then complete secondary education, and the formation of a people's intelligentsia, its technical and creative sections, which would be dedicated to the revolutionary cause. It is also important to secure a steady improvement in the people's material and cultural standards and to display the utmost concern for women, children and old and young folk, i.e. for hundreds of millions of people.

Under contemporary conditions the experience of NEP, the New Economic Policy towards the peasantry and later towards private capital, both foreign and local, which was temporarily introduced in the USSR shortly after the establishment of Soviet rule, is particularly important for countries taking the non-capitalist path. Above all NEP was a concession to the peasantry, the biggest class of small-commodity producers in the country. It was also a deliberate and a well-conceived temporary concession to capitalism: it sanctioned domestic and partially foreign capitalist enterprise on terms which were advantageous to the socialist state and subject to its strict control, invigorated market relations and naturally revived the petty-bourgeois element in a peasant country. To an extent this resulted in a temporary revival of capitalism which inevitably raised the question: Who beats whom?

Lenin and the Communist Party were sure that NEP was necessary, but while introducing it, it was imperative to ensure that the state retained and strengthened its command positions in the economy. This policy which Lenin's critics, both from the right and the left, qualified as a general retreat of socialism that was almost tantamount to the capitulation of Soviet power to capitalism, proved to be most effective in ensuring the success of the socialist economy and ousting the capitalist element, whereas a frontal attack against capital would have been fatal for the socialist revolution because it would have exhausted its economic, social and political resources.

NEP, which used private capital and the peasant initiative under the control of the Soviet government, made it possible to solve two crucial and interconnected tasks, the very same tasks which even more urgently face the contemporary national-

democratic states advancing along the non-capitalist path, namely that of securing the growth of the productive forces, reviving the economy and ensuring its efficiency, development of market exchange between town and country and gradually raising the living standard of the toiling masses. Lenin attached primary importance to the latter problem because he firmly believed that a revolution could only count on the support of the masses if it actually improved their living. In his opinion the struggle waged by the socialist state power against capitalism, which existed in the country during NEP, had to rest on such economic factors as the improvement of the welfare of the toiling masses, the growth and consolidation of the industrial proletariat, the gradual rehabilitation and development of the national economy, and firm and comprehensive state control over private capital.

As regards the economic situation in countries which have taken or are taking the non-capitalist path, it should be noted that four Arab countries — Syria, Iraq, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, and Algeria — are showing a fairly steady economic growth based on the construction of the national industrialised economy and infrastructure in the state sector, and also on the agrarian reform. These countries embarked on the path of non-capitalist development under different conditions; they have different branch structure of the economy, different sources of accumulation, rates and extent of social transformations and, finally, different external conditions. All of them maintain friendly political relations with the USSR and other socialist countries and promote close and mutually beneficial economic cooperation with them. They also draw on Soviet assistance in building up their armed forces.

There are economic difficulties in Guinea and the People's Republic of the Congo, countries with relatively primitive economies and predominantly patriarchal-tribal relations in the countryside. Economic development is slow in view of the active resistance of foreign capital and attempts to remove progressive regimes with the help of conspiracies and even direct military interventions (Guinea). Tanzania has also taken the non-capitalist road and has already made good progress in this direction. In a number of countries where the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship employs very peculiar methods to create a new socially progressive society, non-capitalist development has become the object of an acute struggle between the class forces. Ethiopia, where one of the world's oldest monarchies

was overthrown, is carrying through radical anti-feudal reforms in favour of the peasantry and is ousting the vestiges of the neo-colonial period out of the economy and politics. In these countries revolutionary democracy is exercising ever increasing influence and conducting extensive constructive activity.

There should be no delay in strengthening and stabilising the government, the social system which upholds the interests of the people, and the new national-democratic state, in rallying the patriotic and all anti-imperialist forces and also in promoting very serious improvements in all branches of the economy.

Burma, the only Southeast Asian country which has taken the non-capitalist road, occupies a somewhat particular position. She has carried out major socio-economic reforms: nationalised all foreign and big national capital, the entire private capitalist banking and credit system, and wholesale and semiwholesale trade, deprived the wealthy and middle landlords of the right to impose rent on the peasants and bring the tenants to court. Landlord property rights have been abolished and the positions of village money-lenders have been seriously undermined. Yet, in spite of the extensive change in favour of the people, Burma's economic development is encountering serious difficulties. The introduction of some reforms which were necessary but had not been thoroughly prepared, particularly in the field of trade, money circulation and market turnover, disorganised the market and disrupted economic links between town and country. The internecine war which has been going on for over twenty years has a very dire effect on her economic development. It cripples economic and state activity and makes it impossible effectively to exploit the advantages of deep-going social transformations. There is a perceptible tendency towards compromise with foreign capital and major concessions have been made to it in recent years.

Taking into account the experience already acquired, it would be expedient to set forth certain considerations about the main trends in the economic policy of non-capitalist countries. The expansion of the economy on the basis of the state and cooperative sectors is the economic content of non-capitalist development. The growth of the productive forces in all countries, including those advancing along the non-capitalist road, depends mainly on the maximum utilisation of the internal labour and natural resources, on boosting the productivity of labour and gradually raising the level of its mechanisation, on the all-out strengthening of labour discipline and the elimina-

tion of widespread corruption, on instilling a new attitude towards manual work and the discovery of new sources of accumulation and introduction of strict austerity measures, including a reduction in the portion of the product going to non-productive strata and in non-productive outlays in the national income.

Only a thorough analysis of the actual conditions in each country and a differentiated approach to trade, banking, industrial and other types of capital will provide a basis for determining the forms and the scale of the involvement of private domestic and foreign capital in the development of the productive forces, the measures which the state should employ to control it, the methods that should be used to limit its accumulation and the stage at which it should be partially curtailed and then ousted from the national economy on a steadily increasing scale. It is clear, of course, that progressive politicians and economists in each given country can best solve these economic problems by drawing on the experience of the USSR and other socialist countries in this field.

The countries which are advancing along the non-capitalist road are agrarian countries. The purpose of non-capitalist development is to get the peasants, most of whom live and toil under pre-feudal (patriarchal-tribal) and feudal conditions and partially under conditions which arise in the period of the transition to capitalism, to accept the socialist cause. The diversity of economic structures is the crux of the problem. Practice shows that the development of peasant agriculture in diverse socio-economic structures is crucial for the economy of the agrarian national-democratic countries. Peasant agriculture will remain the foundation of the national economy throughout the long period of non-capitalist development; the social forms of its existence will radically change, and the peasant economy with all the extant structures will gradually form a single co-operative structure.

It is a matter of vital importance for the newly-independent national states to promote the development of the raw material branches of agriculture, including those whose output is exported, and especially the production of foodstuffs so as to make the country independent of imported food.

The agricultural policy of the non-capitalist countries rests on the gradual improvement of agricultural machinery, transition from primitive implements to the more productive ones (the hoe and the wooden plough are still the main agricultural

implements in Asian and African countries), introduction of artificial fertilisers, promotion of comprehensive selection work, organisation of assistance to the peasants and cooperative farms in the sphere of field-crop cultivation and soil management, expansion of irrigation work, and improvement of credit facilities, above all for the toiling peasants. This programme, which has been called the green revolution, is intended to benefit the toiling peasantry and not the landlords, the kulaks or the capitalist farmers.

Some national-democratic states have been paying very serious attention to expanding and strengthening the system of consumer, marketing, hunting and fishing, credit, and to a certain degree agricultural production cooperatives in the villages ever since they embarked on the non-capitalist road. Taken together, all these measures gradually enhance the commodity nature of the economy and its efficiency, perceptibly diminish the importance of patriarchal and subsistence-economy relations, raise the standard of living in the rural areas, enable the newly-independent states to become self-sufficient in food, and also augment their export potentialities.

An agricultural and economic policy in the countryside will hardly be effective if it is not accompanied by a corresponding social policy, i.e. by the introduction of agrarian reforms furthering the interests of the toiling peasants. Such reforms have been initiated in all countries which have chosen non-capitalist development, but so far they have not been completed and no fundamental changes in agriculture have been recorded. The un-cooperated small peasant economy which is frequently divided into tiny lots cannot ensure such changes. What has to be done is gradually to organise medium- and large-scale cooperative or state agriculture which will introduce new methods and machinery that are out of reach of the poor, land-hungry and middle peasants even in the post-reform villages of the East.

The course of events shows that the fairly tense situation in domestic trade in the national-democratic states is not in all cases a result of a shortage of manufactured goods or dependence on imports; quite often it is due to a lack of an organised trading network, the resistance of commercial capital or inadequate utilisation of the possibilities for promoting local handicrafts in the production of clothes, domestic utensils, household goods and so forth.

Judging by the experience of a number of countries, the

nationalisation of the private trading sector, particularly private retail and semiwholesale trade, has a negative impact because it disrupts normal economic activity, the economic links between town and country, and at times arouses the discontent of the population. Thus, as may be clearly seen from the experience of the USSR in the period from 1921 to 1930, and from the current developments in Syria, Algeria and other countries, it will be necessary to retain small and medium private commercial capital (under state control, of course) until the state and the cooperative system is able to assume all the functions of distributing commodities and organising exchange between town and country.

The experience of all countries following the path of non-capitalist development likewise verifies the need to pay great attention to the organisation of foreign trade, a comprehensive state-controlled expansion of foreign trade resources and the reorganisation of import. This is understandable in view of the need to accumulate currency for promoting economic development and expanding production assets. It is most important for these countries to pursue a flexible policy in foreign trade, expand commercial links with the socialist world, introduce state control and regulation and then at the right moment to secure the monopoly of foreign trade which has practically been done in some of them. A foreign trade policy that stimulates the development of the productive forces is usually accompanied, but not sufficiently so, by a curtailment of the imports of luxury goods and other consumer goods which can be replaced by domestic goods, and simultaneously by increased imports of industrial plant and raw materials. Asian and African economists note that imports of luxury goods, expensive cars, diverse beverages and other commodities for the rich still account for an excessively large part of the foreign trade in many national-democratic states. Thus far not all the countries concerned have recognised the strictest economy of state funds, including hard currency reserves, as a vital rule of economic activity.

It is clear from the experience of Syria, Iraq, the Southern Yemen, Algeria, Burma and the Congo that a very significant role is played by the centralisation of the banking system under state guidance, by unremitting efforts to strengthen the country's currency and financial situation and to combat inflationary trends, above all through the all-round development of domestic production and commodity turnover. With a varying

degree of success these measures have been introduced in all the countries although their economic effectiveness is not the same everywhere.

The newly-independent countries which have elected to follow the non-capitalist road should and can, in fact, rest on a stable political system. In the first place this implies the existence of a progressive political party which strives to base its activity on the fundamental principles of scientific socialism, a strong and flexible state apparatus which maintains close links with the people, and finally an army dedicated to the cause of the revolution and the interests of the people. The stability of such a political system depends on its reliance on the masses and their political activity.

Many of the features which Lenin considered essential for the political system of a socialist state are also indispensable for the national-democratic states: correct guidance of the working people, an inexpensive state apparatus devoid of red tape, concern for the needs of the working people and willingness to offer them every assistance. "We must strive to build up a state in which the workers retain the leadership of the peasants," he wrote, "in which they retain the confidence of the peasants, and by exercising the greatest economy remove every trace of extravagance from our social relations.

"We must reduce our state apparatus to the utmost degree of economy. We must banish from it all traces of extravagance, of which so much has been left over from tsarist Russia, from its bureaucratic capitalist state machine." * In order to streamline the political system and cut its operating costs along these lines, it has to be purged of all elements alien to the revolution.

The fairly long history of the activity of all national-democratic states in Asia and Africa shows that Lenin's fundamental views on the state apparatus, the army, the fight against red tape, and the bonds between the state and the toiling masses have lost none of their relevance. All the states which have chosen non-capitalist development pass through the complex phase of the formation of their statehood, but not all of them draw the toiling masses into this process. The gulf between the state apparatus and the army, on the one hand, and the people, on the other, is still very deep. Bureaucratic methods are still widely practised by the old and, for that matter, the new civil

* V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 501.

servants and military officers, and in some countries there is widespread corruption. All this may become a source of social danger and pave the way for the rise and growth of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and, consequently, of bourgeois trends. If a consistent struggle is not waged against such phenomena and if the progressive sections of the toiling masses are not drawn into it, then these negative trends may well become a serious danger, particularly during military and socio-political crises when quite unexpectedly it comes to light that there are solid sections of the military, bureaucratic and parliamentary bourgeoisie which oppose the people, the state and the aims of the national-democratic revolution. The egoism of these sections is boundless, and neocolonialism easily turns them into an instrument for subversive activities and conspiracies. In recent years alone there have been dozens of facts proving this.

* * *

It is hard to name a socio-economic problem of any significance in the liberated countries for the solution of which the study and application of the experience of the USSR and Lenin's teaching had not proved to be highly useful, but only with due account for the national, economic and cultural and historical conditions and the contemporary international situation. One such problem, that of the relations between nations and nationalities living within the boundaries of a single state, occupies a special place on the agenda of the Asian and African countries. And in this respect, too, the Great October Socialist Revolution and the solution of the national, and also of the language question in the USSR have proved to be most valuable.

The national question, or the question of the relations between nations, peoples and nationalities in the course of the socio-class and national liberation struggle, has always attracted Lenin's attention as one of the most important issues in the strategy of the proletarian party in the democratic and the socialist revolutions. In no other country was the national question raised by the very course of history in such a complex and urgent manner and in so many aspects, including the colonial aspect, as was the case in Russia.

Russia was distinguished not only by her great ethnic heterogeneity; she was a multinational country in which the contradictions between the oppressor and the oppressed nations stood out in bold relief. The situation was further aggravated

by the fact that the levels of the historical development of her nations and nationalities were vastly different, that they spoke almost a hundred languages and professed different religions. All these factors accounted for the diversity of the forms of the national-ethnic and socio-cultural relations. There was a close connection between the national and the agrarian and peasant questions. For the most part Russia's Eastern borderlands, which were inhabited mainly by the oppressed peoples, were in Asia, while Russia as a whole was both a European and an Asian country geographically, economically and historically. That accounted for the fact that the solution of the national question in Russia was of international importance, above all for Europe and Asia, and directly influenced the life, the struggle and future prospects of hundreds of millions of people on both continents. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party were aware that the future of the socialist revolution, the stability of the new Soviet system, of the new multinational country and her new socialist statehood in many respects depended on a correct solution of the national and the agrarian and peasant questions in Russia.

The country passed all the key stages of the socialist and general democratic transformations within 20 years after the October Revolution: the first phase of the agrarian revolution (1917-1918), the victorious Civil War against the bourgeoisie, the landlords and the imperialist interventionists (1918-1922), the economic rehabilitation (1922-1926), the industrialisation and the cultural revolution which covered a whole historical epoch (1926-1937), and the collectivisation of agriculture (1929-1932). All the complex problems of the revolution were solved only on the basis of the establishment of friendly relations between all nations, peoples and nationalities of Russia. The cornerstone of the socialist revolution — the alliance of the working class and the toiling peasantry — also acquired a clearly defined national aspect, for as regards the borderlands of the former tsarist Russia it was mainly a question of an alliance between the Russian proletariat and the non-Russian toiling peasantry. This alliance could be established only on the basis of a consistently democratic, socialist solution of the national and the agrarian issues.

There was another no less important international aspect which made the solution of the national question in Russia an issue of world historic importance. Lenin and the Communist Party acted in the realisation of the need to establish a lasting

alliance between the victorious socialist revolution in Russia, in an individual country with relatively backward economy, and the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples. It was apparent to Lenin and the Communist Party that the confidence of almost 80 per cent of the world's population, i.e. of a vast majority of nations and nationalities suffering from colonial oppression, in the socialist revolution in Russia would depend on the extent to which it would be able to further the just national aspirations and put an end to national oppression. Thus, from the very outset the solution of the national question in Russia became a matter of both internal and international significance. Not only the stability of the Soviet system depended on it, but also the course of the world revolutionary process, i.e. the solidarity of the national liberation revolutions in Asian, African and American countries with the Russian socialist revolution.

The European proletariat demonstrated this solidarity already in the first two years after the October Revolution of 1917 by overthrowing the empires of the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs and by rising to the defence of the October Revolution against foreign intervention. Besides, right up to 1925-1927, the imperialist system of colonial domination was being shaken by national liberation movements in China, Mongolia, India, Afghanistan, Iraq and Turkey. Lenin scientifically predicted that hundreds of millions of people in Asia were "destined to follow us on to the stage of history in the near future".* And history showed that he was absolutely right. More than 2,000 million people on three continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America—followed the example set by Soviet Russia, at first after the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917 and then after the victory of the USSR and the Anti-Hitler Coalition over fascist Germany and militarist Japan in 1945. Together with the powerful socialist world, the victorious national-colonial wars and revolutions fundamentally altered the international situation.

At this juncture it is necessary briefly to trace the history of the question. Immediately after the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, i.e. on December 31, 1922, Lenin noted that this event would mark the beginning of a determined, long and difficult battle for the liberation of the oppressed

* V. I. Lenin, "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 610.

peoples. He defined the prospect of the struggle with the utmost precision and realism.

In Western Europe the national question was solved in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, although extremely acute unresolved national problems still exist in Ireland, Spain and some other European countries. In Asia and Africa the solution of this question has been delayed for two and even three centuries; it is being solved not as a purely national one but as a complex national and colonial issue and no longer with the view of accelerating the development of capitalism as was the case in Europe, but in order to combat imperialism and, strategically, which is in keeping with the interests of the working people, to combat capitalism. Deciding that the optimal solution of the national question in Russia lay through the formation of a new type of a multinational federation—a union socialist state of equal nations—Lenin carefully followed the processes that were taking place among the masses of the Eastern countries, situated south and east of the USSR, and strove to create the most favourable conditions for the victorious outcome of the long and difficult struggle.

Lenin's programme for the solution of the national and the national-colonial issues spurns the anti-communist falsehoods of the national chauvinists about the hostility of scientific socialism to the principle of national self-determination. Marxism-Leninism treats progressive national interests with the greatest attention and sensitivity. Socialist internationalism and the proletarian leadership pave the way for the realisation of the just national aspirations of all the peoples, and by no means relegate them to oblivion.

The Bolsheviks proclaimed and implemented in Russia the right of nations to self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of independent states. And it was the Bolsheviks who connected the demands for peace to the peoples and repudiation of annexations and contributions with the self-determination of all, including the colonial peoples, with ensuring that they have every opportunity to decide their own future. In this way they proclaimed the legitimacy of the liberation struggle of the peoples oppressed by imperialism. All the subsequent victorious national liberation wars and revolutions, favourable conditions for which had been created by the Great October Socialist Revolution, and the victory over hitlerism and Japanese militarism, were, one may say, the realisation of the right of nations to self-determination proclaimed by Lenin

and the Communist Party. Displaying tact and pliancy towards the oppressed nationalities, and unconditionally recognising the right of nations to self-determination, including secession and the formation of independent states, Lenin was not only concerned with national feelings, if even of an oppressed nation. He neither absolutised national feelings, nor reduced all social problems to national problems or subordinated them to the national question. On the contrary, he viewed the latter from a class standpoint and took into account the sum total of the socio-political conditions. Therein lies the basic difference between the Marxist-Leninist class internationalist approach to the national question and the narrow, nationalistic approach. Therein lies the essence of the great experience of the CPSU.

Nationalism morbidly exaggerates the role played by the national question and ranks it above all the other issues. An internationalist's outlook is not circumscribed by national relations and he views the national question merely as an element of the class political struggle of the working people. It is a question which cannot be solved apart from other problems of democracy and socialism, and it has to be concerted with the basic class interests of the working people, namely the question of power, and with the interests of the international democratic and working-class movement. That explains why Lenin, while recognising the right of nations to self-determination up to secession, emphasised at the same time: "On the other hand, we do not at all favour secession. We want ... as close an alliance of the greatest possible number of nations who are neighbours of the Great Russians: we desire this in the interests of democracy and socialism, to attract into the struggle of the proletariat the greatest possible number of the working people of different nations."*

Insofar as any solution of the national question in a class society has a class nature, Marxists-Leninists favour a solution that furthers the interests of the majority of the population, i.e. of the toiling classes, the interests of socialism and progress; they fight against the efforts of the reactionary exploiting classes to use the national question to strengthen the bourgeois or feudal regime.

That was how the Soviet state solved the national question, and its invaluable experience in this field is of enormous international significance, above all for the peoples of the East.

* V. I. Lenin, "Revision of the Party Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 176.

The distinguishing feature of Soviet experience is that it combines the self-determination of nations and the creation of their independent statehood with the interests of progress and socialism. The CPSU demonstrated exceptional flexibility and diversity of forms and methods of formally and factually solving the national question on the basis of equality and social justice. This has made it possible to combine the independent and free development of each and all Soviet peoples with their alliance and unity within the framework of the Soviet Union. The voluntary state unification of the peoples for the sake of achieving supreme international and social aims could have taken place only in the form of the socialist self-determination of nations, i.e. in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In that lies the great historical significance of the Soviet forms of national federation, autonomy and a new type of a solid multinational union state.

* * *

Prior to their independence the national question in the Afro-Asian countries was in effect a colonial issue whose solution depended above all on the struggle for liberation from foreign political domination, or, in a word, from imperialism. Such was the essence of the demand for national self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of independent states. Quite often this objective was attained in the course of a long national-revolutionary war: in Vietnam it lasted 25 years, in Algeria, eight years, in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, from 10 to 12 years, in Indonesia, five years, in Burma, three years, and so forth. All the proponents of socialism and progress unconditionally support the principle of national self-determination up to secession and the formation of independent states.

An important feature of the anti-imperialist movement after the 1917 October Socialist Revolution and particularly after the rout of hitlerism and Japanese militarism was that it developed at such a rapid pace and under such favourable international conditions that national self-determination and the formation of independent states quite often overtook the formation of nations. It often happened that the anti-imperialist struggle accelerated the formation of certain features without which a people could not be regarded as a nation and which were either in their embryonic state or did not exist at all.

Not only the formed nations or those that were in the process of formation proclaimed political independence, but also conglomerates of nationalities, tribes and ethnic groups standing at the pre-capitalist stage of development, or where capitalism was only just beginning to emerge. Add to this the arbitrarily established borders of some of the newly-independent states, particularly in Africa, which were inherited from the colonial epoch, the great unevenness of their economic and cultural development, the exceptional diversity of languages and religious differences, and it becomes absolutely clear that the problem of national relations is an extremely difficult one in many of the modern Asian and African states and that its solution brooks no delay.

Today, however, this problem in Pakistan, India, Burma, Indonesia, Nigeria, Sudan, Iraq, Zaire and other multinational and multitribal states can be solved in new conditions; in essence it has become an internal matter of a given state, and not a national and colonial issue. A people implements the right to self-determination in a concrete historical form, within the framework of a young and as a rule anti-imperialist state, and not with regard to the metropolitan country. The slogan calling for state secession, which in the course of the struggle for independence expressed the most consistent anti-imperialist policy, now, under certain conditions, often tends to weaken the national liberation movement and plays into the hands of imperialism. Under these circumstances secession sometimes serves as a cover for pro-imperialist separatism which first debilitates and then brings about the disintegration of a large newly-liberated state whose size and structure are advantageous for the working people and under all circumstances are undesirable only for the imperialist monopolies. In this case, too, the experience of the USSR in solving the national question through the alliance of nations in a single union socialist state acquires increasing international significance.

The Leninist approach to these problems is distinguished by a combination of unconditional recognition of the right of nations to self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of independent states with the interests of the progressive social development of nations, tribes and other language and ethnic groups, and with the interests of socialism. Lenin believed that the national question in each given case should be analysed from concrete historical positions, i.e. with due account for the socio-economic conditions and the fact that

the interests of the oppressed classes should be clearly distinguished from the general concept of the people's interests, and also with a no less distinct division of nations into those that oppress and those that are oppressed. "The demand for democracy must not be considered in isolation but on ... a world ... scale." * As applied to the colonies and the newly-free countries, this means that they have to take into account the influence which one or another variant of the solution of the national and tribal questions may have on the course of the world anti-imperialist struggle. The question of the solution of national and tribal, ethnic and language controversies in the young national states or between them should not become an instrument for implanting hostile separatism which imperialism will promptly turn to its advantage, as has been the case in many Afro-Asian countries.

As before, imperialism continues to exploit and deliberately foment and exacerbate national contradictions and to support reactionary national movements. Suffice it to recall in this connection the course of the anti-imperialist struggle in India, Burma, Indonesia and other countries. Today, the division of the anti-imperialist front along ethnic, language and religious lines is turning into an important factor of the neocolonialist policy pursued by world imperialism. Another poisoned weapon of imperialism is incitement of distrust and hostility to communism, world socialism and the Soviet Union. Obviously the question of the right of nations to self-determination up to and including secession and formation of independent states cannot be raised in isolation from the struggle for winning and consolidating the independence of the country concerned.

Take the Kurdish problem in Iraq, for instance.

The crux of this problem is that of resolving the long-standing contradictions between the Iraqi Kurds, of whom there are more than two million and who live in the oil-bearing provinces of Northern Iraq, and the country's right-wing nationalistic elite, which refuses to grant them equal national rights with the Arabs within the framework of a single Iraqi state. The July 1958 Revolution which proclaimed the establishment of the Iraqi Republic failed to find a political solution to this problem. In response to the legitimate demands of the Kurds for equal rights with the Arabs the then Iraqi Govern-

* V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 341.

ment in September 1961 began military operations to crush their movement. The war was fanned by chauvinistic elements and reactionary Iraqi leaders as well as by external reactionary forces and the oil monopolies operating in the country. The Kurdish movement became widespread and turned into a component part of the anti-imperialist movement of the Iraqi people for strengthening national independence and for social progress. This movement had the support of the progressive democratic forces both inside and outside the country. With the coming to power in 1968 of the progressive wing of the Baath Party which embarked on a progressive domestic and foreign policy, this war between nations became pointless and was brought to an end. On March 11, 1970 the Iraqi Government and the Kurdish movement agreed on a political settlement of the Kurdish problem: the Kurds were granted basic national rights, including national autonomy within the framework of a single Iraqi Republic. Since then many points of this agreement have been realised. The Provisional Constitution includes articles ensuring the national rights of the Kurds. Kurdish has been recognised as the official language on a par with Arabic. The Democratic Party of Kurdistan has received official recognition and five of its members are in the government. Social and economic measures have been introduced which improved the situation in Kurdistan.

Gradually, the heterogeneity of the social composition and leadership of the Democratic Party of Kurdistan began to exert increasing influence on the Kurdish movement. The party underwent a process of class differentiation which resulted in the emergence of two distinct trends. One of them united the party's progressive forces which came out in support of the current anti-imperialist regime in Iraq and for rallying the country's patriotic forces in a united democratic front and for the peaceful settlement of the Kurdish problem on the basis of the 1970 political agreement. The other trend represented the belligerent nationalistic and feudal-tribal elements. It opposed the existing regime, resisted the introduction of progressive socio-economic transformations in Kurdistan and tried to torpedo the agreement. The right wing placed its stakes on the external reactionary and imperialist forces which wanted to weaken the Iraqi regime and turn Iraq into a country suitable for neocolonialists. Under the influence of the right-wing forces the Democratic Party of Kurdistan refused to join the Progressive National Patriotic Front headed by the Baath Party and

strove to undermine the traditional friendly links with the Communist Party of Iraq, accusing it of withdrawing support from the Kurdish movement.

With the assistance of external reactionary and imperialist forces the right wing managed to persuade the Democratic Party of Kurdistan to reject the law granting autonomy to the Iraqi Kurds. This law, proclaimed on March 11, 1974, guaranteed the Kurdish population elementary democratic national and social rights within the framework of the Iraqi Republic. The feudal and nationalistic Kurdish leadership offered armed resistance to the measures undertaken by the Iraqi Government to implement this law and thus provoked a resumption of hostilities in the north of the country. Right-wing forces managed to push the Kurdish movement on to the dangerous path of separatism which isolated it from the democratic and progressive forces and deprived it of its democratic and anti-imperialist content. The progressive elements in the Kurdish movement tried to prevent the protracted war from assuming greater proportions and secure a political settlement of the Kurdish problem. Their efforts in this direction had the support of the Communist Party and all the other progressive forces in Iraq.

As time passed the movement's reactionary feudal and tribal leadership contacted external forces hostile to Iraq and it was not long before it fully exposed itself. The Kurdish sheikhs deliberately refrained from introducing the social reforms which had been proclaimed in Iraq, and the peasantry in the north of the country was in a most difficult situation. Things have changed now; the civil war which had been fanned by reactionary external forces in the hope of tearing the oil-bearing regions away from the country has been ended. An agrarian reform is under way and large feudal estates are being liquidated in the Kurdish Autonomous Region of the Iraqi Republic. Land is distributed among the poorest peasants and the fellaheen are uniting in cooperatives. Feudal nationalism, which had formed a bloc with foreign reaction, proved to be a failure.

This is a striking example of how external reactionary forces interfere into a conflict between nations in the hope of bringing about the disintegration of a relatively large united state because its policy is directed against the "oil" imperialism of the international monopolies.

Under new conditions, when the representatives of the liber-

ration movement, and not the colonialists are in power, the self-determination of nations cannot be automatically identified with state secession. A struggle against separatism is not repudiation of the principle of national self-determination. In this respect the Soviet Union's support for the Nigerian Government's actions against the Biafra separatists was quite understandable. The latter had the backing of the supranational oil monopolies which were well aware that if small Biafra were torn away from Nigeria, a large country with a population of 70 million, they would lay their hands on hundreds of million tons of oil. Using the Ibo people's demand for self-determination and the formation of a separate state, US and other imperialists together with the bourgeois-feudal tribalists made an attempt to fragment Nigeria, a state with the biggest population in Tropical Africa, and turn it into a plaything of the international monopolies. The Nigerian people, which had the support of the socialist, non-capitalist and other friendly countries, safeguarded their unity and statehood in the course of an almost three-year-long armed struggle against the forces hostile to Nigeria's unity. Of course, the national and tribal question in Nigeria is still unresolved, but why should separatism, which would lead to the disintegration of a large and viable state, be the best way of solving it? The same applies to Burma where for many years the imperialist and chauvinistic forces backed by tribal and feudal separatists have been trying, under the pretext of self-determination, to split this multinational state with a population of 35 million, fragment it along feudal and tribal lines, and thus strengthen their own positions in Southeast Asia.

That explains why the right to self-determination, as Lenin pointed out, "is not the equivalent of a demand for separation, fragmentation and the formation of small states. It implies only a consistent expression of struggle against all national oppression." * There are many different forms of self-determination making it possible to combine the interests of nations, nationalities and tribes with the economic and political advantages of a large state. In this respect the intranational development and the transformation of the patriarchal-tribal structure in the remote regions of the USSR coupled with the implementation of diverse forms of national statehood within the boun-

* V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 146.

daries of a large, powerful, united and centralised socialist state afford a convincing and inspiring example for the liberated countries.

Naturally such a variant of the solution of this question implies consistent democracy and national equality, for, as Lenin said, "the closer a democratic state system is to complete freedom to secede the less frequent and less ardent will the desire for separation be in practice".*

He wrote: "If we are fighting Wilson, and Wilson uses a small nation as his tool, we say that we shall oppose that tool."** Imperialism always strived and will always strive to exploit nationalistic feelings in order to undermine national independence and socialism. And the fight against these attempts is in fact a fight against imperialism, and not, as hostile ideologues falsely assert, against the right of nations to self-determination.

Obviously, this does not mean that self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of national states should no longer be viewed as a means of solving the national question even in the newly-free states. There are cases when no other solution is possible. The latest example is the situation which took shape in the former East Province of Pakistan and the formation of another state, the People's Republic of Bangladesh, in its place. The absence of organic links with the West Province of Pakistan, the increased exploitation of the East Province in the interests of the West Pakistani bourgeoisie and landlords, the reactionary pro-imperialist regime which was a member of two military and political blocs (CENTO and SEATO), the suppression of national feelings, the dictatorial political rule of the military feudal lords reared in the British and American schools of neocolonialism, combined with the initial unnatural unification of the two parts of Pakistan along religious lines as a result of traditional British colonial policy left the Bengali people no alternative other than to wage an armed struggle for full state independence. In this they had the direct support of India and the political backing of the USSR and all progressive forces.

* * *

There are numerous forms of national self-determination and

* V.I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 146.

** V.I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 195.

the revolutionary-minded representatives of the national minorities in the liberated countries search for such forms which would strengthen the anti-imperialist forces of the multinational state. Of immense value to them in this respect is the experience of the Soviet Union. Applied in the USSR for the first time in the world federation on an equal national basis received widespread recognition in the liberated countries. Their progressive forces realise that the real solution of the national question should not lead to disunity, hostility and severance of the existing friendly ties. The road to it lies through the establishment of not only formal, but real equality of nations, through the struggle against the chauvinism of the ruling ethnic group and local nationalism which often degenerates into separatism. This is obvious to the progressive elements in the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia in the liberated countries. They also take into account that imperialists want to dismember individual large middle-size and even small newly-independent multinational states. From this point of view India, Burma, Indonesia, the countries of Indochina, Iraq, Cyprus and some countries in Africa are of great interest for the imperialist strategists. This interest is pregnant with danger for those countries.

The development of the national culture and language, the involvement of representatives of all nations and peoples into the machinery of state both in the centre and in the provinces, the democratisation of the political system, the gradual improvement and levelling out of the factual, cultural and economic standard of the peoples—such are the tested methods which have been used by the Soviet Union and which can create favourable conditions for the solution of the national question in any Eastern country.

Lenin warned that it was dangerous to apply ready-made formulae of socialist construction in the Soviet East which were not based on practice. It was particularly important not to transfer automatically the experience of socialist transformations in the more advanced regions to the backward border areas, but gradually, with every consideration for the local conditions, to carry out a number of transitional measures along the road to socialism without running ahead, and to lead the masses never losing contact with them. The training of national personnel was of decisive importance for the economic and cultural development of the Soviet republics, and the Communist Party devoted special attention to this problem. In this respect,

too, the proletarian centres in Russia rendered the Eastern republics inestimable assistance by sending experienced workers there.

Lenin always stressed the need consistently to implement the full political equality of the Soviet republics, abolish their factual economic and cultural inequality and ensure that economic and cultural development in the non-Russian republics would proceed at a faster pace than in the RSFSR. His letters to the Communists of Turkestan, the Transcaucasus and Daghestan, and the Soviet Government's decrees and instructions formed the foundation for the entire multifaceted practical activity involved in building socialism in the Eastern Soviet republics.

Concerned with strengthening the young multinational Soviet state, Lenin insisted on the need to curb the Great Power tendencies which found their expression in a desire to limit the rights of the republics and to grant them no more than autonomy within the framework of the RSFSR. He maintained that the non-Russian republics should be accorded equal rights with the RSFSR in everything, i.e. he advocated their full equality within the framework of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The colonialists undeviatingly adhered to the divide-and-rule principle in order to preserve their domination. The formation of the Soviet Union as a voluntary state alliance of equal peoples was the first example in world history of the creation of a multinational state devoid of national strife where the equality, fraternity and mutual assistance of the peoples is a fact.

In his notes "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'" written in December 1922, Lenin indicated that the observance of the rights of the peoples of the Soviet Union was a matter of international significance. "It would be unpardonable opportunism if, on the eve of the debut of the East, just as it is awakening, we undermined our prestige with its peoples, even if only by the slightest crudity or injustice towards our own non-Russian nationalities." *

A most instructive lesson to be derived from the struggle of the peoples of Russia's eastern borderlands for national and

* V. I. Lenin, "The Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, pp. 610-11.

social emancipation was that it took place under the banner of proletarian internationalism, and not of bourgeois nationalism. This was due to the fact that it was guided by the Communist Party.

Prior to the October Revolution there was almost no industry on the territories of the present-day Soviet Eastern republics. In terms of economic development the eastern border regions of tsarist Russia differed but little from Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan. With the establishment of Soviet rule a highly developed socialist industry was created in an exceptionally short historical period in the Soviet Eastern republics. The five Central Asian republics—Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia—by far surpassed the neighbouring foreign countries in industrial development. For instance, the aggregate amount of electricity produced in these republics with a total population of 35 million, is three times higher than the combined output of Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Egypt, Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan with a total population of nearly 210 million. The rates of industrial construction in the non-Russian republics are much higher than the average rates in the USSR as a whole.

Economic development provided the basis for overcoming the cultural backwardness of the formerly oppressed peoples and for the cultural florescence of the socialist nations constituting the USSR.

Taking into account the great achievements of the Soviet nations in building a multinational socialist state which for more than half a century already has been an inspiring example of liberation from colonial and national oppression and all varieties of social subjugation, public leaders and politicians in the liberated countries are bound to search for such methods of resolving the national question which would make it possible to combine the satisfaction of the just national demands of the peoples with a general consolidation of the anti-imperialist front and advancement along the path of progress and socialism. That is what the way the national question was solved under the guidance of the CPSU in Russia teaches them.

* * *

As a result of the victory of the socialist system and its inherent economic, political and ideological unity a basically

new, formerly unheard of community of people has come into being in the USSR, a community both social and international—the Soviet people.

Foreign friends often ask the Soviet people how did they manage, in an extremely short historical period, within a mere five years after the 1917 October Revolution, at a time when the Civil War was in its final stages, to lay the constitutional foundations of a new type of state and ensure formal political equality. How did it happen that by the beginning of the 1930s, some fifteen years after the October Revolution, prerequisites had already been created for solving the national question in the production, socio-economic and cultural spheres on the basis of the equality of all nations? The answers to these questions are to be found in the following words of Leonid Brezhnev: "*A new historical community of people, the Soviet people, took shape in our country during the years of socialist construction. New, harmonious relations, relations of friendship and cooperation, were formed between the classes and social groups, nations and nationalities in joint labour, in the struggle for socialism and in the battles fought in defence of socialism.*"*

Theoretically and in practice friendly relations between classes and social groups, nations and nationalities may appear only under definite conditions. Insofar as we are talking about the Eastern countries, which were dependent states only recently, the decisive role is played by the elimination of foreign imperialist political domination and influence. Practice shows, however, that this is not sufficient. If, in carrying through radical social reforms and promoting the all-round development of the productive forces, the state administration avails itself of the objective possibilities, gradually limiting and then abolishing private foreign and domestic capitalist ownership of the means of production and exchange in town and country, of land and water (and the availability of water is of vital importance for life in the peasant East), and particularly large and medium feudal and bourgeois property, then the possibilities for the exploitation of man by man, of class by class, and of nation by nation in the country concerned will gradually decline. In contrast to private feudal and bourgeois ownership, which inevitably disunites people, foments national discord and

* 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, p. 92.

breeds and strengthens national and tribal oppression, state and cooperative property and also the joint labour of the employed population in the interests of society just as inevitably bring the people together, wipe out national strife and do away with national and ethnic inequality.

As soon as society's social structure changes, new objective laws of the development of national relations on the basis of the trend towards social progress also come into operation.

Now it is clear to all progressive people in the liberated countries that no party can move towards social progress without gradually transforming the country's economy, carrying through a thoroughly considered programme of nationalisation of large-scale industry, transport and banks, and without abolishing all landed estates, turning the land over to the peasants and their gradual cooperation. Now it is clear that national liberation without social emancipation can neither be full nor harmonious, and cannot build up a new progressive community of people based on social as well as national equality. This is what the experience of the USSR and the CPSU teaches.

Soviet experience shows that the abolition of private feudal and capitalist ownership of the instruments and means of production not only puts an end to exploitation of nations by other nations, but also creates prerequisites for accelerating the approximation of the levels of socio-economic and cultural development of nations, peoples and ethnic groups in Soviet society, for that has made it possible to employ such an effective weapon as state economic planning on a nationwide scale. Planning became the foundation of the unity and cohesion of nations which was achieved as a result of the implementation of the Leninist policy of fraternal mutual assistance.

The large and more advanced nations of the Soviet Union were quick to come to the assistance of the small and economically and culturally less developed nations and the latter began to gravitate towards an alliance with the large socialist nations.

The Marxist-Leninist leadership of the CPSU has always played and is continuing to play a decisive role in the development of the socialist nations and the socialist state, in the formation and consolidation of fraternal friendship between

the peoples and in the international cohesion of the Soviet nations.

Soviet people never underestimated difficulties nor concealed the setbacks and temporary defeats which they encountered in the course of building a new state. They never allowed themselves to say that the road to socialism for the economically backward peoples was easy and smooth. It was a difficult road and called for a great deal of effort, hard work and privations. But at all times the CPSU resolutely countered all forms and manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism on the part of both large and small nations, and worked consistently to rear all the labouring people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The practice of fomenting national contradictions between peoples and states for the sake of their own benefit and of stirring up base, chauvinistic feelings in opposition to the friendly and fraternal relations between the peoples, has become widespread not only in the liberated countries but also in all the capitalist countries: in Europe, the USA, England, Ireland, Canada, the Republic of South Africa and elsewhere. In some industrialised capitalist countries national and racial antagonisms are so acute that they have taken the form of an armed struggle between different nationalities, communities and religious groups.

In view of all this the experience of the formation of the multinational Soviet socialist state acquires a truly exceptional significance. There is every reason to say that Lenin made a brilliant scientific forecast when he noted: "A socialist Soviet Republic in Russia will stand as a living example to the peoples of all countries, and the propaganda and revolutionising effect of this example will be immense."*

In generalising the Soviet experience of solving the national question and creating a socialist statehood it is very important to draw on the documents of the CPSU Congresses and International Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties. The international aspect of these decisions is extremely interesting for it includes the experience in resolving the most difficult problem, that of the transition to a national revolution, and from it to a social revolution with due consideration for the peculiarities

* V. I. Lenin, "On the History of the Question of the Unfortunate Peace", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 448.

of the stage of development of a given nation. Taking the current situation into account the liberated countries would benefit greatly by drawing upon this aspect of the Soviet Union's experience, i.e. the dialectical transition from the national liberation revolution to the social one. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on the national question brilliantly demonstrates its viability not only in the gains of the USSR and other socialist countries, but also in the triumphant development of the national liberation movement. This experience is continuously generalised and developed in the theoretical activity of the CPSU and its Central Committee, in the struggle of the international communist movement.

The 24th CPSU Congress attached a great deal of attention to developing the Marxist-Leninist teaching about nations and national relations in the period of communist construction. It indicated the ways of securing the further florescence and drawing together of the Soviet nations and nationalities, the consolidation of their friendship and all-round cooperation, the strengthening and development of the new historical community of people, the Soviet people, and once again convincingly showed that the countries that have taken the path of national liberation and social progress can draw on Soviet experience.

The programme of the struggle for universal peace and security of nations advanced by the 24th and further developed by the 25th CPSU Congress has a special aspect relevant to the liberated countries. The liberation of the still oppressed and unequal nations, the protection of the sovereignty of nations and the normalisation of relations between them, the promotion of friendship and cooperation are in the centre of attention of the CPSU which opposes imperialism's arbitrary meddling in the relations between nations and its violations of national state sovereignty. Proclaiming the lofty principles acceptable to all, the Programme of Peace asserts that socialism and national freedom are inseparable and that victorious socialism ensures the genuinely sovereign rights of the peoples.

Scientific socialism and Soviet experience in building a new society do not demand that they should be unconditionally accepted. Socialism's ideological opponents contend that Soviet experience is a canon and that Marxists demand that all should follow it without regard for the time, the place and the concrete historical situation. This is a time-worn ruse with which socialism's class enemies hope to provoke a nationalistic protest on

the part of the peoples of the liberated countries against scientific socialism.

Socialist experience was formed and is being formed in the course of a tense and victorious revolutionary struggle which had its setbacks and individual transient features. But Leninism formulated a theory of the general laws of the movement towards socialism which has been confirmed in the practical experience of the USSR and other socialist states and in the struggle of the working class and working people in all countries, and is now being interpreted in the light of the new phenomenon called non-capitalist development. The theory and practice of scientific socialism, and the Soviet experience of building a new society enrich the contemporary national liberation movement, which does not want to stop half-way attaining only national and state independence, but advances boldly towards social emancipation.

Some Features of a Socialist-Oriented National-Democratic State

The question of the state is the most important question of any revolution. This is an axiom. The past bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic revolutions and all the socialist revolutions of our epoch have fully confirmed this Marxist-Leninist premise. It was likewise confirmed by all the national liberation revolutions which have taken place on all continents in the course of unequal decades-long struggle of the oppressed nations against foreign domination.

For the contemporary national-democratic revolutions which decide upon the path of socialist orientation for their respective countries, the question of the state is undoubtedly of decisive importance. Owing to the nature of our epoch socialist orientation as a progressive trend in the newly-independent Asian and African states springs from the radicalisation and deepening of the social aspects in the national liberation movement, and in contemporary anti-imperialist nationalism. Thousands of links connect this trend in the development of the national liberation movement in the Afro-Asian countries with the division of the world into two social systems, which was responsible for its appearance, with the relatively important role played by the working class and also with the great influence of scientific socialism in the liberated countries. Many socio-political aspects of this phenomenon stem from its progressive orientation, as well as from the actual initial conditions in which it emerges. Thus, in order to understand why some states shift to the path of socialist orientation it is absolutely neces-

sary thoroughly to compare their experience with that of countries standing close to them in terms of socio-economic conditions, but which have chosen a different path of development. As a result it will be possible to ascertain features that are common to the majority of the former colonies and also the specific features of the progressive socio-political orientation without overestimating them. It is very important to use the comparative method in studying all aspects of non-capitalist development, including the political, state and legal superstructure, and the forms and general laws of social and political life.

The problems of the rise and development of a socialist-oriented state are of topical theoretical and practical significance. They are connected with the future of hundreds of millions of people, with the choice of the main paths of social development and with the verification of the socio-political conceptions advanced in the course of the class struggle on the basis of the experience of the development of countries and continents. Scientific socialism and its conception of non-capitalist development are confirmed by the fact that the peoples of many of the former colonies have chosen the path of socialist orientation.

Asia and Africa have entered the epoch of national and social revival and their revolutionary forces are paving the way to the future. This is an extraordinarily difficult task. Colonialism has left behind a dire heritage — a backward agrarian economy, illiteracy, mass poverty and disease, and patriarchal-tribal and feudal social relations. Suffice it to say that such a large continent as Africa (not counting the Republic of South Africa) accounts for a mere one per cent of the world industrial output. The share of the Afro-Asian countries in world trade is also insignificant.

The socio-political picture of the world has changed radically in the recent decades. About 100 countries have thrown off the colonial yoke and have won political independence. By taking the path of national-democratic revolutions a dozen countries with an aggregate population of over 120 million carried out major social reforms which create conditions for the transition to socialist construction in the long run. Among them are the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma, the Republic of Guinea, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the People's Republic of the Congo, the Republic of Iraq, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of

Tanzania and other countries in which socialist orientation is gradually paving the way for itself, not without serious difficulties and at times long periods of regress, or in which the transition to this orientation is rapidly maturing (the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, the People's Republic of Benin, the Lao People's Democratic Republic). A socialist-oriented state comes into being as the revolution gains increasing momentum and depth. The struggle for the non-capitalist path of development and the establishment of a socialist-oriented state is under way in many Asian and African countries.

Powerful processes opposed to socialist orientation are in progress in some of them. This indicates that bourgeois orientation is beginning to get the upper hand there and that the movement towards socialism is being stemmed by a pro-capitalist policy. In recent years the danger of this taking place has appeared in the Arab Republic of Egypt.

A socialist-oriented state is a new phenomenon. Its creation reflects a fundamentally important direction of social development of countries, which had thrown off colonial dependence, and embodies the hopes of many peoples striving to get rid of exploitation, poverty and oppression. In its resolution the 24th Congress of the CPSU called the countries that had chosen the path of non-capitalist development "the advance contingent of the present-day national liberation movement".

Socialist orientation is a difficult path, because it involves the creation of material and socio-cultural prerequisites for socialist construction in countries which as a result of imperialist domination are often centuries behind in their economic development. Many of them are still in the meshes of feudal, and even of patriarchal and tribal relations. In many liberated countries the newly-formed seats of modern industry are becoming seriously deformed. Capitalist relations are relatively widespread in the countries of North Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. All these social structures, all these birthmarks of diverse socio-economic formations making up a multistructural economy, intertwine in a most fantastic fashion and give rise to adverse socio-economic and class tendencies. It is only natural, therefore, that the path of socialist orientation is strewn not only with victories but also with deep crises of development, and at times with temporary setbacks. In some countries the reaction took advantage of the inadequate vigilance of the masses and with the support of the imperialists managed to

cut short their non-capitalist development and push them back onto the old road of exploitation and capitalism.

The difficulties which a socialist-oriented state encounters in the course of its development are likewise due to the internal contradictions inherent in the bloc of democratic classes and sections of the population in whose interests state authority is exercised. This bloc is not only a form of an alliance resting on the community of aims to be achieved in the course of the solution of general democratic and national tasks, but also an arena of struggle between the consistently revolutionary, democratic forces, on the one hand, and forces expressing the interests of those sections of the national bourgeoisie which to one or another degree can support anti-feudal and anti-imperialist transformations, but which are not and cannot be the vehicles of socialist orientation in the social sphere, on the other. The ultimate objectives of the working people and the non-working sections which participate in the democratic bloc do not coincide. In contrast to the working people who aspire to socialism, the radical bourgeois elements use their participation in the bloc to reduce the scale of anti-capitalist transformations and in the long run entice the peoples onto the path of creating an independent bourgeois state. Therefore alongside the evolution of a national-democratic state towards the left and the formation of a revolutionary democracy, it sometimes happens that under pressure from bourgeois and pro-bourgeois elements in the bloc it evolves to the right.

Non-capitalist development is marked in the first place by the break-up and collapse of the old social structure, a radical change in the correlation of class forces, profound contradictions which determine its complexity, an intense socio-political struggle and the possibility of sharply deviating from the line which is regarded as optimal by the consistently revolutionary forces.

These contradictions are immanent factors and it is necessary to bear this in mind. The external conditions of the development of the young states are difficult enough. Alongside an extremely favourable factor of vast historical importance — the extensive and increasing assistance of the countries of the socialist community which opens before the former colonial peoples an opportunity to bypass capitalism or shorten the period of its development and not evolve through its higher stages (industrial, monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism) — there are other factors such as, for instance, continuous imperialist pres-

sure, and at times even direct encroachments by the imperialist powers, and intensive economic exploitation conducted in "legal" forms as a result of the involvement of the Afro-Asian countries in the world capitalist economy. All these external contradictions may be regarded as the most important ones at the current, initial stages of the progressive reforms, which are designed to stabilise a national-democratic state's development along the non-capitalist road, consolidate a progressive political course and protect the progressive regimes. In many respects the direction of the national liberation movement depends on the solution of these contradictions. But there are also internal contradictions stemming from the very nature of non-capitalist development. And it will be impossible correctly to apprehend the prospects of socialist orientation unless these contradictions are analysed and taken into account.

The internal contradictions of non-capitalist development are diverse and the one that merits the greatest attention is, of course, the heterogeneity of the social basis of the national democracy and, consequently, of the national-democratic state. The forces which unite in order to carry through radical anti-imperialist social reforms are most dissimilar and mobile; they represent different classes and are therefore unstable. They are dominated by radical petty-bourgeois nationalistic elements in whose ideology the consistent implementation of the anti-imperialist platform is manifested through the concepts of "national," "subjective" socialism. The national democracy's socialist tendencies inevitably change as the development of the revolutionary process alters the correlation between the general national and class objectives in favour of the latter. Marxists are confident that the socialist orientation of the national liberation movements is right for their countries and are sure that progressive and deep-going reforms can in fact pave the way for socialism, because they appreciate the serious revolutionary potential of the intermediate petty-bourgeois sections. Lenin wrote: "The petty bourgeoisie does not always and in general guard the existing order, but on the contrary often takes revolutionary action even against the bourgeoisie (specifically, when it joins the proletariat)." *

Yet Marxists must reckon with the indecision of the petty-

* V. I. Lenin, "Revolutionary Adventurism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 199.

bourgeois sections, their heterogeneity and inconsistency, and with the vacillations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which Lenin exposed to the full on the basis of the experience of the political struggle in Russia and other countries. In view of all these factors a demarcation of the intermediate sections and a departure of some social groups and strata from a progressive orientation to the more moderate, pro-bourgeois positions are inevitable. The crux of the matter is what tendencies will become predominant within the national democracy, and this, in the final analysis, depends on the extent to which it will be influenced by the struggle between the two world social systems and by the labouring classes, the working class in the first place.

This is the main but not the only contradiction of non-capitalist development and it permeates a fairly large number of tendencies arising from the extreme complexity of socio-political and economic conditions. Let's take a brief look at some of them.

Non-capitalist development is marked by a serious and permanent conflict between the economic need to promote rapid industrial and agricultural growth and the improvement of the people's well-being which calls for the involvement of domestic and foreign capital, and the political need to restrain and limit the growth of the domestic and foreign capital in order to avert any deviation from the chosen path of socialist orientation. Only a flexible and at the same time a science-based, and not a subjectively pragmatic solution of this issue can guarantee progress along the non-capitalist road. Any disregard for the economic or political aspect of the matter, any inability dialectically to assess the problem may lead to a shift either to the right or to the left and is fatal to socialist orientation.

The importance of ensuring rapid economic growth is self-evident. In effect the non-capitalist path is an attempt to overcome backwardness at an accelerated pace. But economic growth should not be taken for socialism, as some ideologues of "national socialism" in Asia and Africa are inclined to believe. If that was the case then countries that have made certain economic progress with the help of capitalist methods — Liberia and the Ivory Coast in Africa and Malaysia and the Philippines in Asia — would have to be regarded as having taken the socialist path. In actual fact, however, these countries have become greatly dependent on neocolonialism.

Socialism is a class and political concept; it is not a mechani-

cal result of certain economic indices and is not reduced to them. A certain level of economic development is a prerequisite for socialism and not its content. As regards the essence of socialism, it consists in the socialisation of the basic means of production and exchange, and the establishment of the rule of the working people. If the "national socialism" proclaimed by many leaders and political parties in African and Asian countries is not backed up by radical revolutionary transformation of the society and the involvement of the working people in political rule, it inevitably degenerates into national-bourgeois reformism which capitalises on the popularity of the socialist ideas and the aspiration of the masses to genuine social justice.

On the other hand, the attempts to accelerate the development of the social processes exclusively by political methods in disregard for the need to promote economic growth, and immediately to put an end to the mixed economy and concentrate all the economic resources in the hands of the state do not produce the desired results and in the long run impair the revolutionary perspective.

Possessed of full state power the revolutionary democrats, naturally, can proclaim an uncompromising struggle against the private sector and the national bourgeoisie and carry out extensive nationalisation involving even retail trade. These measures were carried out in some countries. But owing to their low economic potential and lack of experience in state regulation of the economy they result in a violation of economic links between town and country, between a given country and the world market, in supply and sales difficulties and the folding-up of production, and in the long run not only impede the movement towards socialism, but also stand in the way of any and all progress. A hasty, ill-considered nationalisation, economically unfounded construction of industrial projects lead to the appearance of unprofitable enterprises which weigh heavily on the national economy. The task of a socialist-oriented national-democratic state is to find a correct proportion between the state and private sectors and ensure the effectivity of the socialised enterprises and the economic system as a whole, and not to abolish the private sector within the shortest possible period of time. To a considerable extent it is this contradiction between the economic and political interests that defines non-capitalist development. On the one hand, socialist orientation calls for the consolidation of the positions of the working people, the weakening of the influence of the bourgeois elements and an ever

more consistent introduction of socialist elements and conceptions into all spheres of human activity. On the other hand, the interests of economic growth call for a long-term utilisation of the private sector, naturally, subject to certain restrictions and state control. But this may result not only in the preservation but also in the strengthening of the positions of private capital within certain limits. A mixed economy always implies a struggle. The private sector, in its efforts whatever the cost to surmount the state-imposed restrictions, relies on the bureaucratic and corrupt elements in the state apparatus. Only a correct political line can be a guarantee against excesses that may stem from legal private initiative. Revolutionary-democratic states have as yet to neutralise the negative effects of the economic influence of national and foreign capital. Such is the immensely difficult and responsible task facing the forces favouring non-capitalist development.

A characteristic feature of all Asian and African countries, particularly the socialist-oriented ones which are carrying out the most consistent reforms, is the profound contradiction between the conscious desire to advance and the burden of the vestiges of the past. This contradiction is clearly manifest in the superstructure, including the state structure.

In the development of the socialist-oriented states there are many features which spring from the heritage of the past or from the contemporary struggle against imperialism, and not from the socialist perspective. Nevertheless, the processes occurring in the superstructure can ensure the progressive development of these countries, and progressive historical tendencies are forcing their way in these forms even if they are far from perfect and as yet not consistently socialist.

Many socialist-oriented states still lack the material, political, economic and cultural preconditions for the appearance of a socialist political superstructure. Hence the contradictory nature of their political regimes. They are supported by the masses, including the working class which is in the process of formation, because the transformations which they are carrying out further the interests of the working people. But, as a rule, neither the working class nor the peasantry have so far become active and independent participants in political affairs: they have no decisive say in the state apparatus or in the elective representative bodies. The political leaders have still not fully rejected the idea of "patronising the people". Quite often the state apparatus created by the national democrats is either

a military or a semimilitary one, particularly at the early stages of the development of these states, and democratic political institutions are absent. In this period the national-democratic regimes are under the serious influence of personal power.

But if a national-democratic rule preserves its links with the working masses and remains loyal to revolutionary ideals, it makes certain headway towards consistent democracy and guides the state machinery along constitutional and legal lines.

In many respects the difficulties attending the development of a socialist-oriented state arise from the novelty of the processes taking place in it and from lack of necessary experience. Of course the forces advocating socialist orientation in Asian and African countries will benefit greatly by drawing on the experience of Mongolia, Tuva and the Soviet Central Asian republics (particularly the Bukhara and Khorezm People's Soviet Republics in the period from 1920 to 1924), which were the first to take the non-capitalist path and where Lenin's idea about the establishment of people's (peasants') Soviets was translated into reality. Several other fundamental conclusions which Lenin formulated on the basis of the experience of the above countries (concerning the social composition and the role of the revolutionary-democratic party and how it could be turned into a party of scientific socialism) are of vital significance for the correct development of the socialist-oriented countries. But it should be taken into account that the non-capitalist development in Mongolia, Tuva and the Soviet Central Asian republics took place under conditions which were different from those under which it is taking place now in the socialist-oriented countries, and the alignment of classes within the countries and of international forces was also different. Thus, not only the forms of this development are different in the socialist-oriented countries of Asia and Africa, but also its content and strategy. Mongolia and Tuva, and particularly the Soviet Central Asian republics, were in effect isolated from the capitalist world and were neither economically nor politically dependent on world capitalism. Non-capitalist development in some of them was directly guided by consistently socialist forces, the Communist parties (Bukhara and Khorezm), while others were a component part of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat (the Turkestan Republic, for instance, which from the very outset was a part of the RSFSR), and all of them relied on the direct and all-round support of the victorious socialist revolution

in Russia, on the assistance of the proletarian state power.

State power in the socialist-oriented countries is in the hands of a special socio-political grouping—the national revolutionary democracy which is connected with a bloc of class forces, and not with one or another class. As a result, state power, so to speak, acquires a certain degree of independence and endeavours to carry out socio-economic transformations in the common interests of the democratic bloc “from above”. Yet many trends within the national democracy are prone to vacillation owing to its internal contradictory nature. “Both past experience and current developments show that socio-political conflicts in such countries may have all kinds of twists and turns.” *

Sometimes national democrats carry out measures that are detrimental to the interests of the working sections, evoke their mass discontent (Burma, Egypt, etc.), and precipitate major and acute conflicts. Quite often this takes place under the influence of internal reaction and hostile external forces which exploit mass discontent in order to widen the breach between the state and the people and topple the national-democratic, anti-imperialist regime. The result is a period of a bitter class struggle for the very existence of the national-democratic state and its principled political orientation. In the past ten or fifteen years there have been instances of the downfall and regress of socialist-oriented states and the restoration of conservative, national-bourgeois order in them.

As regards the social basis of the revolutionary-democratic rule, it is both heterogeneous and marked by internal contradiction. Under these circumstances the certain degree of independence of state rule is not always conducive to the consolidation of the state; on the contrary, it tends to weaken it if the inconsistent, conservative right-wing elements begin concentrating the command positions in the government in their hands. It follows that the consolidation of all genuinely democratic forces and the creation of national unity should be coupled with a class approach to appreciating the substance and aims of this unity and with the strengthening of the positions held by the revolutionary-democratic progressive forces.

In spite of all the objective and subjective difficulties which socialist-oriented countries encounter in their onward march, processes favourable for socialism are gathering momentum in

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 87.

them. An expression of these processes is the transformation of the main institutions of the national-democratic state.

Turning to the basic trends in the development of the statehood of the socialist-oriented countries, there are a number of aspects which are of especial significance for theoretical conclusions and practical activity.

In the first place it is necessary to mention the fact that the transformation of the state in a socialist-oriented country is of a revolutionary nature, i.e. the change of the state structure has a tendency to modify the substance of state power. The latter is wrested from the bourgeois metropolitan countries, the wealthy domestic pro-imperialist and often compradore bourgeoisie, the feudal lords and the tribal nobility. Henceforth it belongs to the majority of the people (in the concrete historical meaning of the word). Thus, it is the kind of power, which, within some socialist-oriented countries, can on the whole be described as a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the people. At the current stage of development it is still not a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, but given favourable circumstances it can, in the course of the further deepening of social reforms, become an historical precursor to such a dictatorship, a step towards it.

A national-democratic state is called upon to bring the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolution to completion, to do away with the monopolies and the domination of foreign capital, strengthen the country's political and economic independence, promote in every way the development of the state sector in economy, guarantee broad democratic rights and freedoms to the people and their actual participation in state policy-making, ensure the introduction of the agrarian reform and substantially improve living standards.

Hence a national-democratic state basically differs from an ordinary bourgeois state. But as distinct from a people's democratic state it is a broader coalition of democratic forces where the working class is still unable to play the leading role but, even if it is numerically small, strives to rally ever broader sections of the masses round itself in the course of the struggle for social progress and gradually attains an influential or a leading position. Such a state consummates the national liberation democratic revolution and inaugurates the transition to non-capitalist development.

A people's democratic state, on the other hand, is a state of the working people where the leading role is played by the work-

ing class which ensures the transition to socialist social transformations, i.e. to direct socialist construction.

State power is not identical in all the socialist-oriented countries and has its concrete historical colouring. The latter depends on the social composition of the forces comprising the democratic bloc, on the role played in this bloc by the working class and other sections of the working people, and on the nature of the actual role played by the revolutionary-democratic party and its ability and competence in running the state.

Today it is a matter of the utmost theoretical and practical importance for the socialist-oriented countries either to break up or transform the old and build up a new state apparatus. The experience of these countries shows that the abolition of the old and the gradual creation of a new state apparatus is a typical feature of both the national-democratic and the people's revolution. But in some of the socialist-oriented countries these processes are not only long-drawn-out but have their peculiar features.

The liberated countries inherited a legacy of economic backwardness, universal illiteracy and a tremendous shortage of cadres from imperialism. In some countries of Tropical Africa only a few per cent of the population are literate and there are only a few dozen people with a higher education. On top of that, in most cases they comprise the local pro-Western, pro-bourgeois elite which has been trained by the colonialists and as a rule stands guard over their interests. To a certain extent, therefore, the renovation of the state apparatus is retarded by the class resistance of the privileged groups and also by the lack of the necessary cadres.

There is also another side to this process, however. Revolutionary democrats in some countries are convinced that their party should be omnipotent and, consequently, the sole and all-embracing vehicle of political power. Accordingly, party bodies are authorised to fulfil the functions of state organs; as a result party and state activity is consciously combined at all levels, and the formation of an integral structure of the state apparatus is also retarded. A supreme united party and state organ is created (usually a revolutionary council), and local party organisations are entrusted with the performance of state functions in the localities.

Now the principle of selecting cadres according to their efficiency and political reliability is being introduced in a number of countries. People from the labouring sections of the popula-

tion are being more widely drawn into the state bodies. There are countries where laws prohibit the exploiters from holding leading posts in the state apparatus and from being elected to representative bodies, and where special schools for training personnel for the state apparatus are being set up, which accept people from the labouring sections of the population in the first place. All these measures foster closer ties between the state apparatus and the population.

Alongside the renovation of the cadres, changes are taking place in the system of the state organs and in their internal structure. The formal bourgeois parliamentarism has been liquidated in almost all the countries where it was artificially implanted by the colonialists. Bourgeois and landlord circles accepted it as a means of consolidating their political domination after the achievement of independence (Burma, Syria and some other countries). Reactionary institutes have been abolished, tribal chiefs, sheikhs and sultans have been deprived of their administrative powers, and the administrative-territorial division in some countries has been changed. Now, priority is being given to the formation of representative organs, either people's councils or similar organs which in the future will comprise the political foundation of a socialist-oriented state. In view of the state's increased social and economic activity the number of ministries concerned with economy, as compared with purely administrative ones, is also increasing and their influence in the organs of the state administration is growing.

Some countries are introducing measures to ensure the participation of the working masses in state administration and industrial management, although it may be purely formal at times.

Working people's assemblies and production committees have been set up at the industrial enterprises, and trade union representatives enter administrative councils of associations of state-operated enterprises. All these facts and also a broad discussion of draft constitutions and codes of law by the population, nationwide discussions of draft development plans, the establishment of an obligatory proportion of the representation of workers and peasants in the elective state organs and of priority representation of poor peasants on cooperative farm boards, the restriction of the political rights of certain categories of the non-working population and many other measures are characteristic of the early phases of the development of democracy in the state and economic administration. On the

other hand, it is obvious that some revolutionary-democratic parties are afflicted with long spells of the fairly widespread malady, that of the fear of the masses, and in the performance of their leadership functions rely more heavily on the state apparatus packed with the old bureaucratic and corrupt elements which are divorced from, and in fact oppose the people. Sometimes when the struggle against this trend is not decisive enough, a country may become exposed to the danger, not without the influence and interference of the domestic and external reaction, of a coup d'état, of a paralysis of the state apparatus and the degeneration of the revolutionary-democratic state into a bourgeois military and political dictatorship over the people. There have been such examples in history and the danger of events taking this course does not decline with the introduction of ostentatious, formal democracy.

The modification of the structure of the state apparatus usually goes hand-in-hand with changes in the forms and methods of its activity. At present revolutionary democrats regard democratic centralism as the basic principle of the organisation and activity of the state apparatus. There are clauses to this effect in the Constitution of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. In 1972 the Burmese Revolutionary Council issued a special resolution on the introduction of the principle of democratic centralism in the activity of the state apparatus.

The state apparatus is strengthening its links with public organisations. Some of them are entrusted with definite state functions, others participate with the state organs in resolving various problems of social development. There are public organisations which fulfil the role of a large armed force, such as the numerous people's militia in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and in the Republic of Guinea. Its basic functions include protecting public buildings, maintaining law and order and doing patrol duty.

While setting up new organs and state and legal institutions, socialist-oriented countries are continuing to use some of the old institutions and forms of state organs which are filled with a new content. In many countries the president is invested with very broad personal powers (he issues ordinances which carry the force of law, dissolves the national assembly, retires the government, etc.); they have an institute of administrative supervision (control over the local elective bodies by government-appointed administrators), appoint the courts, etc. All these

facts have already been examined in various books, but what remains to be studied from the general theoretical and political point of view is whether it is possible and expedient to use the old state and legal forms, and the manner and the extent to which this should be done. Of course, the filling of these state and legal forms with a new content is in a way tantamount to the liquidation of the old institutes conducted from within. However, it still remains to ascertain the possible length and intensiveness of this process, and to decide which old forms can be used and in what way, and how to neutralise the reverse, negative impact of the old forms on the functions of the state apparatus which is being renovated. A searching examination of practical experience will provide the answers to all these questions. At the same time the experience of the socialist-oriented countries poses more and more questions before the researcher.

Soviet scholars regard the contemporary progressive, socialist-oriented regimes as the revolutionary-democratic rule of the people. Naturally, it requires a much broader social basis than the existing one, because it has to become the rule of the working people, i.e. of the majority. Its political mainstays are a progressively-minded army, an anti-imperialist state apparatus, dedicated to social progress, and a progressive political party. Quite often the banner of a progressive, people's revolutionary-democratic rule is raised by the patriotic anti-imperialist officers, whose fidelity to the revolution is an important earnest of its victory. Yet it is impossible not to agree with the fact that a constant threat will hang over all the gains of the working people's rule so long as it does not have a party of scientific socialism as its nucleus. The experience of the USSR and all the other socialist countries proves this.

United Anti-Imperialist Front of Progressive Forces

The eviction of the colonialists from almost one hundred countries has not yet solved all the tasks of national liberation. The immediate task now is to consolidate the victory of the national liberation revolutions and the rule of the anti-imperialist forces, and to protect the progressive regimes against encroachments by imperialism and neocolonialism. The objective conditions for this are at hand. With the support of the world revolutionary movement the progressive social forces in the former colonies are trying to make the most of the favourable situation to strengthen national independence and reorientate the national liberation revolutions towards social progress.

* * *

The anti-imperialist orientation of the national liberation revolutions has not only been fully preserved but is continuing to deepen with the result that the progressive transformations and trends lately in evidence in the liberated countries are meeting with the determined resistance of the imperialist and domestic reaction. The consolidation of the progressive national-democratic regimes and the growth in the number of countries orientated towards socialism have upset the neocolonialist plans of the imperialists. Nevertheless, attempts are still being made to impose the capitalist path upon the young developing states so as to enable the imperialists to preserve their economic positions and political influence in them and

bring them into the orbit of the world capitalist system.

Chester Bowles, a far-sighted imperialist politician with a professional knowledge of the problems facing the Asian countries who was twice US Ambassador to India and between these appointments was Under Secretary of State, had hoped to combine foreign policy interests with the social, economic and political revolution in these countries. In the past twenty or twenty-five years the imperialist countries put in a great deal of effort to assume patronage over the national liberation movement and implant capitalist relations in the liberated countries. But as they went about their plans the imperialist ideologues and politicians encountered the usual insurmountable difficulty: they were unable to formulate a single social doctrine, or to spell out a single political trend which would have appealed to the progressive elements of the liberated countries by its purposiveness, its promise for the future and originality. Such ideological and political debility is not accidental. Imperialism and colonialism are inseparable whatever the form they may assume—the old, traditional, or the new, neocolonialist.

Now it is not only a question of taking from the peoples of the former colonies, but also of returning to them a considerable portion of what had been plundered, in order to keep them in the world capitalist economy. This necessity did not arise in the past, because the colonies and dependencies had in fact no alternative other than capitalist development. Today, a new, socialist perspective is open before them, and this has strengthened the anti-imperialist forces of the liberated countries a hundred-fold.

At the same time it would be interesting to know why, after the collapse of the colonial system, imperialism still has the opportunity to pursue, and at times not without success, its colonial policy, even though in a veiled form. To answer this question it is necessary to analyse the world economic ties fettering the development of the national states.

Both the world capitalist economy and the world colonial system took shape at about the same time. The inception of the capitalist mode of production coincided with the rise of the colonial empires. These interconnected processes reached their completion in the epoch of industrial capitalism, particularly at its highest, imperialist stage. The final colonial division of the world took place when capitalism's industrial basis and world capitalist economy had already been formed.

By the mid-20th century the old colonialism collapsed under the blows of the national liberation revolutions, but the world capitalist economy remained. This offered the imperialist states an opportunity to adapt to the new situation, to preserve and even heighten the economic dependence of the former colonies which these states mask with declarations of assistance to the liberated countries.

It is, nonetheless, important to bear in mind that in the period of the collapse of the political forms of colonialism and the struggle of the liberated countries for economic independence, neocolonialism stands for a policy of perpetuating the economic dependence of these countries. The very fact that neocolonialist plans are carried into life behind the façade of assistance speaks of the weakening rather than of the strengthening of imperialism, although it also proves that the latter still has considerable political, economic, military and ideological opportunities to influence the liberated countries.

Under present-day conditions the struggle against neocolonialism and for actual economic emancipation from imperialism objectively leads the liberated countries to search for other, anti-capitalist roads of development. But their firm and undeviating movement in this direction wholly depends on the conscious activity of the peoples themselves and their revolutionary vanguards.

In our day there are no or practically no mass popular movements which lack spontaneously inherent socialist potentialities. This is a sign of the times. And it was no accident, therefore, that almost all popular revolutions in postwar Asia and Africa were not only anti-imperialist but had certain anti-capitalist features as well. Historical development confirmed the well-known truth that attempts to resolve the fundamental socio-economic problems of the developing countries with the help of capitalist methods and under the guidance of the national bourgeoisie prove to be futile in general. This experience also shows that everywhere where in the course of the national liberation revolution the masses managed to create a popular or a national-democratic regime, they were promptly confronted with the problem of reorienting the development of their countries in the direction of socialism.

At the same time these processes brought into particularly bold relief the specific role played by the state in the liberated countries, the great significance and influence of the parties and groups standing at its head and individual progressive leaders

who had decided to break with the capitalist system. In the first place this applies to the leaders of the national democracy which has become an alternative to the bourgeois leadership. It came to power due to the discontent of the broad masses with the results of the development along the capitalist road, and to some extent mirrored their hopes and aspirations.

As regards its class nature the political authority of the national democracy in the liberated countries in general terms expresses the interests of the left democratic bloc incorporating representatives of the peasants, the petty and, sometimes, the middle urban bourgeoisie, the working class, the radical intelligentsia and the students. This does not mean, however, that all these forces are represented in the administrative apparatus. If we take into account the political groups which stand at the helm and not the general political line of the national democracy, attention should be paid to their characteristic features, at the early stages of their leadership in particular. The most important is the relative uniformity of the social composition of those forces which are in power, all of whom as a rule come from the national intelligentsia and military officers. They are closely welded together by their identical social background, education, psychology and practical experience. All of them have close personal relationships which took shape in the course of a long common struggle and joint assumption of power, usually as a result of a state revolution.

Another characteristic feature of these groups is that they stand in certain isolation from the social classes. Quite often they have no indissoluble links with any of the classes and in many cases are not subject to any concrete social forces. National-democratic regimes rely not only on the political organisation of one class or another, but mainly on the army and the administrative apparatus. As a rule they are military-revolutionary dictatorships corresponding to the interests of a wide bloc of class forces. These military dictatorships are the product of the traditional disunity of the peasants and small-commodity urban producers, and the heterogeneity of the elements making up the basis of national democracy. Politically they frequently balance between different classes, groups and social strata and capitalise on their inherent contradictions. These features of a national-democratic regime spring from an insufficiently precise class differentiation in some countries, the weakness of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and the immaturity or total absence of their class organisations.

Obviously, the relative independence of the national-democratic rule does not mean that it stands apart from the class struggle and that its political line does not depend on the correlation of the class forces. The course of events compels national democrats to adopt a definite class position and to define their political line more precisely. The need to make a choice between various class approaches to concrete political issues becomes more and more imperative. This considerably stimulates the development of the national democracy at the present stage, and leads to the appearance of diverse political trends in its midst and to differentiation and internal, class stratification.

* * *

The class and political differentiation of the national democracy accelerates when it attains power inasmuch as it becomes necessary to solve cardinal problems of the country's development and to formulate and implement a concrete political course.

Suffice it to pose some questions concerning domestic and foreign policy to see this. What should be the attitude to the agrarian reforms? Who supports their consistent introduction in the interests of the peasantry, and who retards them? Who is orientated towards establishing all-round cooperation with the socialist states, and who desires to give priority to promoting the development of ties with the bourgeois West? Who believes that the road to secure independence and progress lies through the strengthening of the state sector of the economy and who is more inclined to stimulate the growth of capitalist enterprise? Who wants to instil elements of socialist conceptions into the consciousness of the masses, and who encourages isolation and nationalism, and does not oppose religious fanaticism and anti-communism? All these and similar issues lead to stratification in the ranks of the national democracy.

* * *

Practice is a criterion of truth. Parties, classes and politicians are judged by their deeds and not by what they say about themselves. From this point of view it is necessary, even if briefly, to examine the achievements of revolutionary democrats in some of the states where they are in power, and to appraise how radi-

cal and democratic are their social reforms, to what extent they are in keeping with the interests of the people and whether or not they are consistently anti-imperialist and anti-feudal.

Let's take a look at some countries with progressive regimes.

Iraq. Prior to June 1958 Iraq was a colonial monarchy. The Arab Socialist Renaissance Party (Baath), the Communist Party and a number of other democratic parties formed the National Unity Front and in July 1958 carried out a revolution which deposed the reactionary regime. Shortly afterwards, however, the Front collapsed owing to lack of unity, and the government which was formed following the July revolution was overthrown. In February 1963 the Baath Party assumed power; after that came a period of coups until in July 1968 the Baath Party, mainly its left-wing democratic forces, once again came to power. From approximately that time systematic efforts were made to unite the activities of the democratic and progressive forces and to establish a united front with the Communist Party and other progressive elements.

The struggle for the formation of a united front that would become the mainstay of the progressive state came to a victory in July 1973. A Progressive National Patriotic Front consisting of the Baath Party, the Iraqi Communist Party, national Kurdish organisations and independent democrats was formed. The sixteen-member Supreme Committee which heads the Progressive National Patriotic Front formulates its policy.

An important feature of the Front is that all the parties forming it retain their political, ideological and organisational independence. Its main task is to mobilise the masses and ensure their participation in political, economic and social reforms which are carried out on the basis of the country's non-capitalist development. The Front's social basis consists of workers, peasants, office workers, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the patriotic sections of the middle bourgeoisie. The army is the bulwark of the government. The supreme organ of state power is the National Council of Revolutionary Command headed by the President of the republic. With the backing of the Progressive National Patriotic Front it nationalised oil production and instituted state control over all foreign trade, introduced progressive labour legislation and social maintenance and pensions for industrial and office workers. In line with special legislation industrial and office workers participate in the management of the industry.

An agrarian reform under which land is distributed free of

charge among the landless peasants or those who have small plots is under way. The payment of compensation for land confiscated from the landlords has been terminated and the main emphasis is placed on the development of all forms of agricultural cooperation.

In March 1974 Iraqi Kurds were granted autonomy within the framework of the Iraqi Republic, and a year later military operations in Kurdistan were ended. The boundaries of the Kurdish Autonomous Region have been defined and the legislative and executive councils have been set up in it.

Tanzania. Until recently she had two political parties — the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) and the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) in Zanzibar. TANU had a membership of nearly two million. In 1967 it drew up a programme called the Arusha Declaration which stated that Tanzania was to build socialism.

All foreign and local banks, insurance companies, railways, ports, shipping and air lines, power stations and the post and telegraph have been nationalised. The state sector controls 90 per cent of the imports and 60 per cent of the exports, and all or the bulk of the shares of the leading industrial and commercial firms have passed into the hands of the government. A state industrial corporation has been founded which controls from 51 to 100 per cent of the shares of all industrial companies. A state corporation of trade controls trade in the country and regulates prices. Customs duties have been levied on imported luxury goods. Prior to the proclamation of independence the key industries were gold mining and diamond and tungsten mining. Now the country produces coal, oil, chemicals, cement and has a developing textile industry.

The land has been nationalised and agriculture accounts for 40 per cent of the GNP and 85 per cent of the export. All feudal plantations that cultivated aromatic vegetables have been confiscated on Zanzibar and the land has been distributed to the peasants in keeping with the principle "The land belongs to those who till it".

Fairly large settlements for the collective cultivation of land are being built in the rural areas. They are called "socialist villages" or *udjamaas*, and unite more than 10 million peasants. The main organisational principle of these villages is joint labour on collectively-owned land and distribution of profits according to the quality and quantity of work. These villages have public lunch-rooms, schools, hospitals and kindergartens.

All members of an *udjamaa* are allowed to cultivate a private plot and to use the harvest for domestic needs and sell a part of it on the market.

Modern land cultivation methods and mechanisation of agriculture are being gradually introduced. Tanzanians regard the *udjamaas* as the foundation of the new society free of oppression and exploitation.

Far-reaching social reforms have been carried out: compulsory universal elementary education and free education at schools have been introduced, young people's and women's organisations have been set up and a network of political schools and specialised educational institutions has been established where school graduates are trained in one or another profession for a period of one or two years. Much is being done in the field of health service, mother and child care, and the social maintenance system has been considerably improved.

In February 1977 TANU and ASP merged to form a single Revolutionary Party. This unification is a milestone in the country's political development and attests to the further consolidation of Tanzanian progressive forces.

Algeria. On July 5, 1962, after a sanguinary seven-year anti-colonial war waged under the leadership of the National-Liberation Front which united all the patriotic forces of the country, Algeria was proclaimed a people's democratic republic. Since June 19, 1965, which is observed as a revolutionary holiday, full power has been placed in the hands of the Revolutionary Council which is both the highest state and party organ.

The national referendums of June 27 and November 19, 1976 approved the National Charter and the Constitution of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria. On December 10, 1976 Chairman of the Revolutionary Council Houari Boumedienne was elected President for a six-year term, and in February 1977 elections were held to the National People's Assembly, the country's highest legislative organ. Preparations are under way for a congress of the ruling National-Liberation Front party to be held in 1978 which will draw up a programme of action, adopt a permanent charter and elect the leading bodies. Prior to their formation the Revolutionary Council will remain the country's highest political body.

The National Charter is an important programme document consolidating the gains of the Algerian people and defining the main trends of the development and deepening of the Algerian

Revolution. Algeria's historical tasks, states the Charter, are consolidation of national independence, the building of a new society free of exploitation of man by man and whose guiding principle will be "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work". It proclaims hired physical and mental workers, and also peasants, soldiers, young people and the revolutionary patriotic elements as the motive forces of the Algerian Revolution and calls the National-Liberation Front the guiding, leading and inspiring organ of the revolution. It assigns major tasks to the social organisations—the General Union of Algerian Working People, national unions of Algerian peasants, young people and women and organisations of war veterans operating under the leadership of the National-Liberation Front party. The Charter states that trade unions have become a school of socialism.

The Charter speaks of the significance of public and above all of state ownership of the means of production. It notes the state's great role in economic development, in creating the material basis of socialism, in carrying through social transformations in the interests of the working people, in enlarging the system of education and promoting science and culture.

At the same time it points out that socialism recognises private property which is not connected with exploitation and explains that in Algeria such property is that of the artisans, peasants, petty traders and even small entrepreneurs. It mentions the need for strict state control over the private sector and the danger of underestimating the bourgeoisie's subversive political and ideological activity. According to the Charter, representatives of the propertied sections of the population are banned from holding responsible party and state offices.

It is clear from the Charter's content that the revolutionary democrats who authored it are subject to increasing influence of scientific socialism. All sincere proponents of Algeria's socialist orientation regard the Charter as a long-term programme for bringing the country's progressive forces together and actively support it.

In spite of the dire heritage of colonial domination, Algeria has already made great headway on the road of independent, progressive development. Banks, insurance companies, transport facilities, electric power stations and mining and some other branches of industry have been nationalised. After the nationalisation of foreign capital invested in the oil and gas industry in February 1971, the state-owned SONATRACH Com-

pany controls 80 per cent of the Algerian oil production (in 1976 it amounted to 50 million tons), 90 per cent of the oil-refining, the gas industry and the oil pipeline transport. Foreign trade and a big part of domestic wholesale trade is also controlled by the state, and the rapidly growing state sector now accounts for 90 per cent of the industrial output. The main trend in economic policy is the creation of heavy industry which accounts for more than 80 per cent of state investments.

Private national capital is represented in trade, light industry, handicraft production and in the services industry. It is protected by the state against foreign competition and enjoys certain privileges. On the other hand, all private enterprises are under state control and do not participate in drafting the country's economic policy. A full ban has been imposed on the import of luxury goods. With regard to foreign investment, the following course is pursued: foreign companies submit the designs of enterprises into whose construction they intend to invest, finance these projects, build them and make them operational with the help of their specialists; after that these enterprises become the property of the republic. Algeria repays the foreign credits received to finance construction with deliveries of raw materials or the output of the enterprises which have been built with the help of these credits.

The construction of mixed enterprises involving Algerian and foreign capital is under way, too, and most of the shares belong to the state.

The agrarian reforms now in progress are very important for Algeria's future. In the first years following the country's liberation self-management farms and war veterans' cooperatives were set up on 2.3 million hectares of the finest land once owned by the French colonialists and local collaborationists. The following years witnessed great efforts to raise the efficiency of these farms and improve their self-management system. Nevertheless, until recently the bulk of the peasants were engaged in the private, so-called traditional, sector which embraced 66 per cent of farm lands but yielded less than 33 per cent of the farm produce. More than half of the arable land was in the hands of large and middle landlords and only 10 per cent of the cultivable land belonged to the petty fellaheen who made up 50 per cent of the farm owners. About a million peasants continued to possess only small plots of land or none at all; 50 per cent of the sheep belonged to five per cent of the 170,000 stock-breeders in the country.

These figures emphasise the importance of the reforms which are being introduced in keeping with the law on the agrarian revolution passed on November 8, 1971, which proclaimed the elimination of all forms of exploitation of man by man in the countryside. The law envisages the distribution of land in line with the principle "The land belongs to those who till it", limits the privately owned acreage and head of cattle, and contemplates the establishment of cooperatives and the building of modern villages. By the autumn of 1976, more than 1.3 million hectares of land and about a million palm trees were distributed among the peasants, and five thousand producers' and specialised cooperative farms were formed.

Land is confiscated from those who do not till it, and under the law land owned by absentees (people living in towns and not in villages) is also subject to confiscation. On the other hand, the government helps all the agricultural workers who were compelled to search for work in towns to take up farming again, this time on their own land which they have been allotted.

Working people's assemblies with the task of promoting labour productivity, combating red tape and embezzlement and actively drawing industrial and office workers into the management of production and distribution of profits are being set up at industrial enterprises of the state sector and at national companies in keeping with the law of November 16, 1971 and the Charter of the Socialist Organisation of Enterprises. They have already been set up at more than 500 enterprises employing a total of 150,000 workers. The Algerian leaders emphasise that the further consolidation of socialist labour and production principles, and the enhancement of the role played by these assemblies will enable state enterprises to promote economic progress in the interests of the masses.

Algeria is firmly advancing along the road of planned economic development. Capital investments under the second four-year plan in the period 1974-1977 total 110 billion Algerian dinars. Funds are allocated for promoting the development of the formerly backward regions. Almost a quarter of the state's budgetary expenditure is channelled into education and the training of national personnel. According to the plan, more than four million children were to attend school in 1977. More than 40,000 students are enrolled at Algeria's five universities and other institutions of higher learning. The government is taking steps to put an end to unemployment and illiteracy and enhance the well-being of the working people. The poorest

peasants and working people in the low wage bracket have been exempt from taxes, and the minimum wage has been raised. Free medical care was introduced in 1974 and the system of social insurance is being improved.

These major gains of the Algerian working people, as well as the basic principles of the National Charter, have been included in the 199-clause Constitution of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria which came into force on November 22, 1976. The Constitution also defines the structure and the functions of the republican state institutions based on the strict principles of revolutionary democracy. It is a fact of historic significance that the Constitution directly proclaims that the road to socialism is the final choice of the Algerian people since it is the one and only road which can ensure national independence, create a society free of exploitation and promote the development and efflorescence of the personality. The Constitution proclaims Algeria a people's democratic republic and the Algerian state a socialist state. It stresses that the socialisation of the means of production is the main basis of socialism, that state ownership is the highest form of public ownership, that the country's key economic branches have become for ever the property of the state and that they are subject to state control.

According to the Constitution the main trends in the building of socialist society are the industrial, agrarian and cultural revolutions, introduction of various forms of democratic rule by the working people and the even development of all regions. The Constitution, like the Charter, proclaims the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work" as the principle of the Algerian society. It guarantees the rights and defines the duties of the Algerian citizens, including the right to work and rest, free education and health protection. Any discrimination on the grounds of sex, race or profession is prohibited. The Constitution notes that the National-Liberation Front party is the vanguard, leading and organising force of the people in the struggle for realising the aims of the socialist revolution. In keeping with the Constitution the National People's Assembly, which is elected by direct and secret ballot for a term of five years, is the country's supreme legislative organ. The majority in it and in the local elective bodies has to belong to workers and peasants. The head of state, i.e. the President, is invested with broad executive powers. The vast presidential powers are needed to defend and continue the

cause of the Algerian revolution in view of the intrigues of domestic and external reaction.

Without examining other countries with progressive regimes (Burma, Syria, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo and others) and taking into account only the above information, it is clear that national-democratic regimes are conducting extensive and important work to surmount socio-economic backwardness and get rid of colonial and feudal elements, and are creating conditions for a long period of social progress in the interests of the majority of the population. These regimes concentrate their efforts on creating an independent national economy, overcoming great economic difficulties, and also the resistance of the reaction and the imperialists.

Progressive regimes build the first foundations for social progress, socialist orientation and non-capitalist development and for the eventual transition to the building of socialism.

As can be seen, the reforms introduced by progressive regimes are an object of a bitter internal class struggle and external political and economic imperialist pressure.

There are all indications of social progress in the national-democratic states. Yet the social reforms which had been introduced there did not eliminate social differentiation, the rise and growth of bourgeois, private capitalist elements and the bureaucratic and new strata of the compradore bourgeoisie (Egypt) which have adapted themselves to operating under the new conditions arising from the establishment of the state sector. Capitalist tendencies are becoming manifest in handicrafts, manufacturing and rural small-commodity production. Local commercial and usurious capital holds strong positions, particularly in the countryside, in the services industry and the infrastructure.

The world capitalist market, too, seriously promotes the growth of private capitalist elements.

In recent years a considerable shift to the right has taken place in the economic policy of Egypt's ruling circles which have virtually provided free access to all branches of the country's economy for foreign monopoly capital, the bourgeoisie of the rich Arab countries and national capital. It was an outright deviation from Nasser's social and economic policy and amounted to the country's reorientation towards the imperialist West.

Similar processes have taken place in the Egyptian foreign

policy. There is evidence of a socialist-oriented national-democratic regime degenerating into a neocolonial regime and of the loss of the country's independence.

The steadily deteriorating position of the masses led to serious disturbances in 1977 in the course of which they proved their ability to resist the anti-popular policy of the existing regime.

* * *

At first glance it may appear to be unjustified to raise the question about there being different trends in a national democracy, bearing in mind that from the very start its distinctive feature was rejection of the classical bourgeois road of development and the political domination of the landlords, compradores and exploiter capital. Yet this stratification is a fact, and there is no reason to be surprised. The intermediate strata (it is they that constitute the social base of the national democracy) have always been prone to vacillation both to the left and to the right, and their revolutionariness has its limits.

Nevertheless, it would be a misconception to believe that the right wing of the national democracy expresses only the interests of social reaction which has formed an alliance with neocolonialism and the bourgeois-landlord elite. If that was the case, the national democracy would have ceased to be what it is. It is another thing if we say that under the given correlation of class forces, certain national-democratic circles by some of their actions and their inclination to come to terms with foreign capital and the landlords, objectively play into the hands of social reaction which soberly appraises the place it occupies in society and the state as a result of the loss of its political power and deterioration of its economic positions. The upper stratum of the intelligentsia, which have turned bourgeois and have become West-oriented, officials, top-ranking military officers, the clergy and the newly-formed military-bureaucratic bourgeoisie nourish the right-wing group of the national democracy. The reactionary forces which are bent on halting and reversing the national liberation revolution, manoeuvre in order to establish closer relations with the political authority and to exert a more tangible influence upon it, causing it to incline towards anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

There is another side to the question. Inasmuch as the right-wing group of the national democracy stands in the way of con-

sistent social transformations wishing to halt the revolutionary development of the country and, instead of advancing social aims, puts forward strictly nationalistic ones, supplanting socialist ideals with a slogan calling for the achievement of economic progress whatever the cost, up to the introduction of an "open door" policy for foreign monopolies, the way is objectively paved for a rapprochement between this group and reaction, for a compromise with imperialism in domestic and foreign policy, for one-sided concessions detrimental to the interests of the state and the nation. A revolution is never static, marking time is tantamount to rolling back. As the government's anti-capitalist revolutionary spirit is eroded and the democratic practices of the period of the first radical reforms give way to increasingly bureaucratic methods, there are less and less reasons for the power-seeking social reaction actively to show its discontent, and opportunities appear for a compromise between it and the right-wing national-democrats.

The right-wing group of the national democracy cannot strengthen non-capitalist trends; on the contrary, it prevents their manifestation by fomenting militant nationalism and religious fanaticism, and even more often by lauding the Western way of life and proclaiming a policy of the so-called liberalisation. It opposes united action with the Communists, rejects the formation of a national-democratic front of progressive forces and quite often conducts a repressive policy against them.

Another section of the national democracy, the consistently anti-imperialist one, which reflects the interests of the masses, favours socialist orientation, regarding it as the sole prospect for the country, and is prepared to form an alliance with the Communists, giving them an opportunity to operate within the framework of the progressive front.

No insuperable barrier separates these two groups of the national democracy; they are closely connected with each other by the intermediate links and enter in coalitions with each other, quite often on a non-principled basis.

Still, the left-wing circles of the national democracy oppose its right-wing contingents, although the former, too, frequently underrate the significance of the independent political activity of the labouring masses and their active participation in formulating and adopting important state decisions. As a rule, left-wing national-democrats are grouped close to the leaders, i.e. directly around a leader of a given country. Quite often they prefer to struggle for influencing the leaders, and not the

masses, hoping in this way to find a solution to urgent socio-economic problems. That accounts for the fact that not infrequently right-wing forces manage to oust the left-wing elements from power without encountering massive and determined resistance on the part of the people (such was the case in Bangladesh where a state coup d'etat was effected).

The differentiation of the national democracy is a natural phase in the revolutionary movement, in the evolution of the intermediate social strata and the political parties representing them. This evolution has always been determined by the course of the revolutionary process, i.e. by its objective and subjective conditions.

It follows that the practical activity of a national-democratic party designed to effectuate the policy of non-capitalist development is frequently accompanied by profound internal contradictions which in the course of the struggle can and sometimes do lead to a split. Subject to the potent influence of local traditions and customs some national-democratic leaders become vain, ambitious and turn into careerists. The national democracy's diverse approach to the choice of methods and ways, and also to defining the time limits for the realisation of one or another reform, becomes even more complicated owing to tribal and religious contradictions, personal rivalries and reciprocal mistrust. They are furiously and permanently fanned by internal and external reaction in its efforts to weaken the very mainstays of the national-democratic regimes. Taking advantage of the struggle between the various trends and personal ambitions and putting the national-democratic leaders at loggerheads with each other, the reaction incites them to act against groups that ally themselves with the Marxist-Leninist forces and thus thwart the chances for democratising the regime and further strengthening the relations with the socialist community. Under these conditions it is easy to visualise the "laboratory" where anti-communist prejudices which seriously harm the national liberation movement are cultivated.

It is impossible correctly to understand and evaluate the actual status and the social role of the national democracy without first ascertaining the nature of the present stage of development of the Afro-Asian countries, the place and importance of diverse class forces and the correlation of bourgeois and proletarian elements.

As distinct from Latin America, there is not a single country in Asia or Africa where the working class has become the lead-

ing force of the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement. Insofar as capitalism, as a system of social production relations which have reached the stage of industrial capitalism, has not attained a dominating position in Africa and in the majority of Asian states, it would be interesting to ascertain what social force will be able to express the actual interests of the vast majority of the working people. At the present stage of the anti-imperialist movement this force is the bloc of revolutionary-democratic classes and sections — the working class, the peasantry, the radical intelligentsia and the urban petty bourgeoisie.

At the same time the social transformation of primarily pre-capitalist relations, which takes place in the course of capitalist development in some countries and of non-capitalist development in others, enhances the role of the working class. In recent years its numerical size and level of organisation and political awareness have grown perceptibly, and so has its influence on the development of social relations. Yet, it is still not fully formed. Until this happens, the road to social progress will continue to lie through the national-revolutionary bloc of left-wing democratic elements, the leading force of the revolutionary process.

In the light of the above it is easy to see that the establishment of an alliance of all forces capable of upholding national independence, democracy and social progress in the struggle against imperialism and reaction is an important principle in the activity of Communist parties or Marxist-Leninist groups in Asian and African countries in the current period. This applies even to the Western countries with an established capitalist system where the working class occupies an historically predetermined firm position as the main force of the revolutionary movement. Lenin pointed out that "the proletariat cannot achieve victory if it does not win the majority of the population to its side".* What then should we say about the states where capitalism is still in its early stages and the proletariat has not yet become the main driving force? In such an historical situation an alliance of all national anti-imperialist forces, ranging from the working class to the middle bourgeoisie, becomes an objective necessity.

Hence, the anti-imperialist front is plainly called upon to

* V. I. Lenin, "The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 265.

embrace the entire national democracy and the anti-imperialist forces which are outside of it. It goes without saying, however, that the nature of this front, its opportunities in the anti-imperialist struggle and the ability to contribute to the movement towards socialism depend on the balance of forces within its framework, on precisely who stands at the head of the national-democratic circles and how great is the influence of the consistently democratic, left-wing and socialist organisations and groups on the political course. Therein lies the significance of the differentiation taking place in the national democracy.

* * *

The historic mission of the national democracy, as we all know, is to unite with all the progressive forces in creating prerequisites for the forthcoming shift to the construction of a society of social progress. Clearly, this can be realised all the easier, the deeper the historical experience of scientific socialism will be assimilated and the closer its cooperation and relations with the Marxist-Leninist parties. The Communists of the liberated countries have demonstrated their utter dedication to the cause of national liberation and social progress by their selfless anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle, the struggle for national independence. Side by side with other patriots the Communists, when necessary, waged an armed fight to overthrow colonial, feudal and monarchistic regimes in the course of which they were subjected to vicious repressions and sustained great losses. Both before and after the winning of national independence the Communist parties sought actively to cooperate with all the national-patriotic forces. They play a serious role in the struggle against neocolonialism and domination of foreign monopoly capital and for strengthening national sovereignty and democratising social life in the developing countries. In some countries of Asia and the Arab East Communists are participating in the progressive coalition governments relying on the bloc of anti-imperialist parties.

Marxists-Leninists are in one camp with the revolutionary democrats. Their cooperation is vital inasmuch as the Communists who have great theoretical and practical experience are able not only to bring the ideas of scientific socialism into the masses, but also successfully to implement and guide anti-capitalist transformations.

Unfortunately, due to various reasons, the search for ways and means of achieving unity between the Communists and national democrats in some Asian and African countries has so far failed to produce the desired results. Evidently this is explained by a lack of necessary mutual understanding and the temporary failure to take advantage of the favourable situation conducive to the formation of a solid united front.

The danger consists in that there are representatives of the progressive forces who have failed to appreciate the transient nature of the arising contradictions and the objective need to have misunderstandings and differences reconciled within the shortest possible period of time. Sometimes these contradictions were deliberately converted into a system of insurmountable and fundamentally hostile relations which inevitably caused a split and precipitated a struggle. Upholding the long-rejected sectarian delusions, some leaders in the liberated countries say that it is impossible for the Communists to work with the national democrats who allegedly represent only the anti-communist wing of the petty bourgeoisie. In turn, one or another national democrat adopts an overtly anti-communist position and is mistrustful of the consistently democratic forces.

The imperialists use anti-communism in order to split the ranks of the patriots in the national liberation movement, so as to handicap the further development of the national liberation revolutions and divest them of their anti-capitalist content. One of the main objectives of anti-communism is to tear the national liberation movement away from other contemporary revolutionary forces, the socialist countries and the international working-class and communist movement in the first place.

The anti-communism that is cultivated in some liberated countries has certain distinctive features stemming from the class structure of society, the social roots of the government and historical traditions. In these countries anti-communism is spread not only among the wealthy bourgeoisie and the feudal lords who have lost many key positions in the economic and political fields and who have connections with the West, but also among the large and motley social strata of the petty bourgeoisie. Because of its dual nature its representatives are neither unanimous in their views nor consistent in their attitude to scientific socialism. The most progressive-minded of them favour the unity of democratic, anti-imperialist forces, seek the support of the labouring sections, and try to understand and

assimilate scientific socialism. But owing to different reasons the opposite sometimes takes place. Some petty-bourgeois strata are extremely susceptible to Western propaganda directed against socialism and even hold the latter responsible for the difficulties experienced by their country. And Western anti-communist propaganda with its refined methods offers precisely such an anti-communist "prescription".

The experience of the past several years shows that groups and leaders in the Afro-Asian countries who get carried away by anti-communist passions compromise with the wealthy bourgeoisie, the compradores, the remnants of the feudal classes and the proponents of the pro-imperialist, neocolonialist policy, thus dooming themselves to isolation from the people. Failing to solve a single national problem on this basis, these groupings gradually forfeit the support of the masses, their domestic policy positions weaken and they take recourse to repressions, deviate from their former progressive course and, in the final analysis, face the prospect of disappearing from the political scene.

Whether they want it or not, those leaders who build their policy on anti-communism, anti-Sovietism and pro-Western liberalism inevitably end up by cooperating with the neocolonialist forces. Such cooperation leads to a loss of national dignity, in foreign policy in the first place, and a reappraisal of the internal policy irreparably damages the economy. Even large Asian and African countries with multi-million populations and vast natural resources cannot prevent this happening if their leaders and ruling circles undergo the above evolution.

The appearance of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism on the scene is usually a clear sign of a shift to the right in the camp of the national democracy. The growth of anti-communist feelings may logically result in the degeneration of a formerly progressive economic and social policy, and a shift of the country's leading groups to the traditional positions of militant bourgeois nationalism which inevitably deviates towards neocolonialism. The very first anti-communist tendencies and measures usually signify that right-wing elements in the national democracy which is in power in one or another country are endeavouring to gain the upper hand. All the talk about fidelity to socialist ideals and refusal to compromise with reaction and imperialism hangs in the air as soon as repressive measures are taken against the true champions of scientific socialism and

consistent anti-imperialists, and pro-Western elements gain the upper hand in domestic and foreign policy.

By assuming anti-communist and anti-Soviet positions some representatives of the national democracy discredit their own socialist declarations. Their actions confirm that stratification is gaining momentum in the national democracy and that its attitude to the socialist perspective is by no means conclusive.

In view of the differentiation within the national-democratic camp it is most interesting to examine the alignment of the revolutionary and the national democracy. The concept "revolutionary democracy" embraces all those who act from revolutionary positions, i.e. who do not shun radical measures, and also from democratic positions, i.e. who uphold the interests of the majority and not the minority. In this sense the class spectrum of the revolutionary democracy is very broad, ranging from the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie to the proletariat. This being the case, a characterisation, lacking a precise class definition, of any political trend as being a revolutionary democracy does not disclose its actual social substance. History shows that a deepening of the revolution usually narrows the circle of classes capable of revolutionary activity and fostering consistent democracy. Today it can be said that bourgeois revolutionary democracy of the classical type is a thing of the past. In some countries where the bourgeois revolution has been consummated, the bourgeoisie has exhausted its revolutionary-democratic potential, and it can only manifest itself in individual cases. Yet it should be taken into account that owing to their anti-imperialist nature the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Asian, African and Latin American countries substantially differ from the classical revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe and North America. In many of these countries the class spectrum of the revolutionary democracy remains broad enough in view of the still incompleting process of general democratic transformations.

On the other hand, there is another, narrower qualification of revolutionary democracy as a trend which directly precedes and objectively paves the way for scientific socialism and is the most revolutionary at a time when the necessary conditions for its spread in a given country have not attained maturity. The shift of the most progressive part of radical democratic parties to the positions of the proletariat and scientific socialism is not only desirable but also possible, both theoretically and practi-

cally. History offers many examples of such an evolution of revolutionary democrats.

Obviously a conception of revolutionary democracy in a broader sense most likely should apply to the national democracy as a whole. As regards the understanding of revolutionary democracy as being the precursor of Marxism, it naturally applies only to the progressive strata of the national democracy which are increasingly gravitating towards scientific socialism. All attempts to set off national democracy against Marxism-Leninism, prevent it from spreading and replace it with some sort of a bourgeois philosophy are incompatible with a genuine revolutionary democracy. Moreover, in our age of the general movement towards socialism, it is impossible to be a revolutionary and a democrat, to fight for the interests of the majority of the people and, at the same time, to come out against the Communists. Those who strike a blow at the proponents of scientific socialism also strike at the forces of revolution and democracy in general.

A close alliance of the progressive forces, a primary condition for the success of the anti-imperialist movement and its development along the non-capitalist road, envisages the observance of a range of joint demands, by both the national democrats and the Marxist-Leninists, a common urge for cooperation and an ability to make concessions and to overcome differences. The most important issue which divided the Communist parties and national-democratic forces in the past, and which sometimes stands between them today, too, is the question of leadership. It is a question which calls for a great deal of tact, flexibility and mutual understanding and leaves no room for sectarianism which manifests itself in an a priori demand to extend recognition of the leading role of one or another party without due consideration for the concrete situation. The Communists have made it clear time and again that they do not consider recognition of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist parties by revolutionary-democratic forces a precondition for the establishment of a close alliance between them. On many occasions, both in word and in deed, they proved their desire to join forces with the national-revolutionaries and concentrate their efforts on conducting a joint struggle against imperialism and reaction and for non-capitalist development, and to establish fruitful and constructive cooperation.

A split, and all the more so if it is accompanied by the persecution of progressive elements and repressions against the Communists, tremendously harms the common cause and can bring about the defeat of the people fighting for a just social system. That is why it is very important now to heed the warning contained in the final document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: "A hostile attitude to communism, and persecution of Communists harm the struggle for national and social emancipation."* The interests of the national liberation movement and social progress of the newly-independent countries, the document states, "demand close co-operation between the Communist and Workers' Parties and other patriotic and progressive forces".**

* * *

Today the majority of the countries that have taken the road of social progress recognise the need to build up a solid united front of all the progressive forces of the national liberation revolution and ensure a non-capitalist orientation. A large part of the leaders of the left wing of the national liberation movement appreciate fully the fact that regardless of their convictions, race, religion and world outlook all citizens, political parties and organisations which oppose imperialism and are determined to build socialism can find a broad basis for joint action to further socio-economic progress and the consolidation of their countries' independence. In the past fifteen years this idea has made great inroads into the consciousness of the masses participating in the national liberation movement. There is a general shift to the left; anti-capitalist feelings are mounting and the national liberation movement is entering a new and more profound socio-economic stage.

The growing awareness of the need to set up a progressive front manifests itself above all in the recognition of the fact that under contemporary conditions no class or political party can cope with the tasks put forward by the national revolution singly, by relying mainly on armed force. The basic problems of

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, p. 29.

** *Ibid.*

a given country's reconstruction can be solved only with the broad participation of the masses, the *working class* in the first place, in the anti-imperialist and social struggle.

What is a front of progressive forces? Some leaders of the political parties and organisations participating in such a front believe that it is merely a superficial form of a temporary pooling of the efforts of all forces who are capable of fighting against imperialism and internal reaction. Others think that the front is needed only by all parties and organisations other than the ruling party which already enjoys the monopoly of power. Sometimes it is said that the establishment of a progressive front is expedient only as a means offering greater scope for manoeuvre to the ruling party. By operating within the framework of this front it can balance between the forces participating in it and capitalise on their contradictions in its political struggle. Lastly, there are people who recognise that the creation of a united front of progressive forces is unquestionably a necessary and useful measure but believe that the political activity of the non-ruling parties among the masses should be limited and even banned.

There is no need to prove that these and similar views reject the possibility of the creation of a united progressive front as a militant alliance capable of becoming the widest possible social mainstay of the national-democratic regime in its struggle against imperialism and internal reaction. In a genuinely united front it is possible to create an atmosphere of complete trust, sincere cooperation and militant unity of all the progressive forces of the revolution and particularly its nucleus — the national democrats who are in power and the Communists who actively cooperate with them. A national front is a voluntary coalition of parties and organisations, all of which retain their organisational and political independence and ideological loyalty to their chosen world-outlook, which consciously and sincerely strive for unity of action in order to ensure the success of the national-democratic revolution and implement its anti-imperialist and social programme under the guidance of the ruling party. A national united front of the progressive forces does not stand in opposition to the government; on the contrary, it is its social mainstay and rests on the alliance of the working class, the peasantry, the toiling intelligentsia, the petty bourgeoisie and sometimes even the middle bourgeoisie, provided the latter does not act against radical progressive social transformations.

The formation of a national front of the progressive forces is not designed to unite ideologically heterogeneous parties and organisations into a single party. Nevertheless, it does not rule out, but on the contrary implies, an all-round and painstaking work of gradually *bringing the parties together* in the process of mobilising the masses for the struggle against all pro-imperialist and reactionary forces and the solution of vital social, economic and foreign policy problems. The national front is designed to broaden democracy and draw all able, conscious and progressive-minded citizens into the work of building a new society. The achievement of all the tasks connected with the complete transformation of the social system by abolishing exploitation of man by man which have been proclaimed in the programmes of the national-democratic parties and socialist alliances in some of the liberated countries, objectively and inevitably demands not only the participation of the broad masses in these efforts, but also that they should be fully conscious of the need to fight against imperialism, reaction, ignorance, cultural, economic and social backwardness, and of how this fight is progressing. From this point of view the formation of a united and broad socio-political coalition of the progressive forces in which each party will occupy its proper place in the ranks of the fighters for a new society is the demand of the times.

A ruling party which actively participates in a progressive coalition with other friendly organisations retains the prerogatives of state power. In countries where there are several progressive parties, the ruling party naturally cannot impose its ideology on them and demand that they dissolve of their own accord or merge with the ruling party's organisations. Such demands would be unjustified, incorrect and hasty, and would inevitably prevent the normal functioning of the united progressive front. It is obvious that the internal and external opponents of the national-democratic regime would welcome such conflict between the ruling party and its allies.

Recent developments urgently warn the progressive forces in the liberated countries about the danger of a split in the united front, rejection of joint actions against the common enemies, the advancement of demands which are unacceptable for other members of the alliance, discrimination against their partners and overestimation of the role played by one or another party.

The common struggle of the national democrats and Communists for socialist aims, their joint efforts to overcome the immense difficulties encountered in the course of building a new society and their dedication to the people will undoubtedly lead to a closer ideological rapprochement of the various progressive parties on the basis of scientific socialism. And when, in the course of the anti-imperialist struggle, social reforms and advance along the non-capitalist path, a great deal of experience in the implementation of the socialist programme is accumulated and the vestiges of the past are removed, and when mutual trust becomes an obvious and immutable fact, then the national democrats and Communists can start a dialogue also on the voluntary organisational rapprochement, with due consideration for the full complexity of this problem, on the basis of the further consolidation and fraternal cooperation. Objectively, the road to this is open.

International Detente and the Developing Countries

The past several years witnessed a particularly tense struggle between the forces of socialism, the national liberation movement and peace and progress, on the one hand, and reaction and imperialism, on the other. This period was marked by a further strengthening of the world socialist community, the growth of its might and its impact on international politics, the establishment of still closer and more durable relations between the socialist countries and the developing states, and victories of the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In these years a smashing defeat was inflicted upon the imperialist aggressors in Indochina which was yet another striking manifestation of the invincibility of the liberation movement of the peoples if they are determined to uphold their freedom and independence and rely on international solidarity in their just struggle. The long and heroic struggle of the peoples of Indochina culminated in complete victory: the imperialists and their henchmen have been driven out. The victorious outcome of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Indochina attests to the bankruptcy of the imperialist policy of gross interference in the affairs of other countries, and of the failure of the tactic of local wars conducted for the purpose of "throwing back" and "containing" the peoples that have taken the path of struggle for national liberation and social progress.

The victories of the heroic Vietnamese people and the patriots of Indochina radically altered the balance of forces in Southeast Asia, which for a long time was the object of aggression of international imperialism, in favour of the champions of peace, national independence and progress. With the liberation of South Vietnam there appeared real prerequisites for realising the behest of the great son of the Vietnamese people, Ho Chi Minh — the creation of a united, peaceful, independent, democratic and flourishing Vietnam.

The peoples of Indochina achieved their great victories because at all the stages of their just struggle they had the mighty material, moral and political support of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, the international communist movement and all the revolutionary forces of the world. The establishment of a new climate in international relations was yet another factor contributing to the favourable outcome of developments in Indochina. There is a clear connection between the successes of the national liberation forces in Indochina and the new trends in international relations, the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and its allies. These successes offer additional proof that the policy of international detente consistently pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries creates favourable conditions for the struggle waged by the peoples for national and social emancipation and effectively blocks the aggressive plans of imperialism and reaction.

International detente, whose results are felt in all corners of the world, does not develop spontaneously. It is a product of the conscious and unremitting influence of the USSR and other socialist countries on international relations, of their consistent peaceful policy which is supported in the liberated countries. World socialism is invincible. There is no longer a force in the world which could set itself the wild task of destroying socialism without the risk of committing suicide. Therein lies the fundamental shift in the balance of world forces. That is why thanks to the all-round strengthening of the positions of socialism, to the economic, cultural and scientific achievements, and also to the growing defensive capability of the socialist countries, they now have wider opportunities for influencing the course of world events and international politics in the first place. The spread of the principles of peace and co-operation that are intrinsic to socialism to the sphere of international relations has an increasingly beneficial impact on world

politics and enjoys the backing of all freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples.

The successful implementation of the Programme of Peace has gradually improved the situation in Europe. The conclusion of treaties by the USSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia with West Germany and also the treaties signed by the two German states have put a seal to the postwar period in Europe, made it possible for the states to overcome the dire heritage of the Second World War—the long cold war—and build peaceful relations on a reliable basis. The socialist countries, the developing states and all the peace-loving forces in the world have set themselves the noble aim of consolidating and developing the striving of all peoples for peace, of broadening and strengthening the emergent trends towards cooperation in Europe, America, Asia and other continents and turning them into a permanent and irreversible factor of international life.

The adoption of the principles guiding the relations between the USSR and France and between the USSR and the USA played a very important part in securing the shift to peaceful coexistence and cooperation between countries with different socio-political systems. Particularly important are the series of agreements concluded by the USSR and the USA in 1972, 1973 and 1974, and in the first place the agreements on the prevention of a nuclear war and the limitation of strategic armaments.

The peaceable policy of the USSR and other socialist countries has led to major positive changes in international relations. "In the new situation," Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, "the leaders of the bourgeois world have also come to realise that the cold war has outlived itself and that there is need for a new, more sensible and realistic policy. Our calls for peaceful coexistence have begun to evoke serious responses in many capitalist countries."*

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries do not view peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and detente in international relations as transient phenomena. They are the permanent objects of their foreign policy and create favourable external conditions for the building of socialism and communism. In full conformity with the will of the Party and the entire Soviet people, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union continues actively to fight for

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 556.

the consistent implementation of the Peace Programme with the view to making irreversible all those positive changes that have taken place in the international situation.

Of historical significance is the Final Act drawn up by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and adopted and signed by 33 European and two North-American states in Helsinki in 1975. The significance of this great victory of the peace forces cannot be overestimated.

The normalisation of international relations concerns not only the states involved; it also creates a new atmosphere in the world and profoundly influences the life of all peoples and states, big or small, in all parts of the world. The CPSU and the Soviet Government actively pursue a policy of peace being firmly convinced that it is consistent with the national interests of all countries and peoples without exception.

The Soviet Union resolutely works for the liberation of the last of the oppressed nations, upholds the sovereignty of the liberated countries, secures the normalisation of relations between nations and the establishment of relations of equality, friendship and cooperation between them, demands an end to imperialist and racist diktat in the relations between nations and states, and the establishment of equitable international economic relations. "The Leninist principled and consistent support of the liberation movement of the peoples," said Leonid Brezhnev, "the strengthening of friendship with the newly-free countries, and the fraternal alliance with the Communists of the whole world and the working-class movement of all countries invest our peace policy with even greater strength, influence and popularity across the globe." * The Programme of Peace proclaims the noble principles of universal peace and security of the peoples. It asserts that victorious socialism most fully ensures the sovereignty of the peoples.

How does international detente benefit the developing countries? This is an important question. The fact of the matter is that although the Soviet policy of peace has the support and sympathy of an overwhelming majority of nations and states, it also has its opponents. They are not only the imperialist circles, which stubbornly hang on to bankrupt ideas, anti-Soviet military blocs that have outlived themselves and the policy of "internationalisation" of local armed conflicts, but also some reactionary leaders who sacrifice the interests of genuine national

* Ibid.

liberation and social progress at the altar of nationalistic ambitions or egoistic and, in the final analysis, unrealistic calculations of capitalising on a clash between states with opposite social systems.

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of inter-state relations designed to ensure lasting and universal peace which is essential for building a society of social progress, a socialist and communist society, and ensuring the victory of socialism in the historic competition with capitalism without resort to a thermonuclear war which spells death to humanity. The policy of peaceful coexistence creates favourable conditions for the life of all nations and peoples and for the struggle of the working people in the industrialised capitalist countries against the monopolies, for the successful outcome of the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples against racialists and colonialists, and for the advancement of the developing countries along the road of social progress.

Contrary to the assertions of the enemies of international detente, the consistent peaceful policy of the USSR and other socialist countries by no means signifies a rejection of the class struggle. Peaceful coexistence is neither peace at any price nor an unprincipled covenant justifying all concessions and compromises; it is a desire to improve the international atmosphere and build relations between all the states on the basis of equality, justice, sovereignty, international law and mutual benefit. Under the conditions of universal peace and security of the peoples not a single nation or state will be the loser; the fighters for freedom, independence and social progress, all the democratic movements will have the most favourable opportunities for actively participating in international intercourse, protecting their legitimate interests and struggling against exploitation, colonialism and racialism precisely under conditions of peaceful coexistence, and not under conditions of a universal war.

Marxists-Leninists and all the other sincere proponents of peace do not regard the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems as a result of the removal or alleviation of the main contradiction of our epoch, namely the contradiction between socialism and capitalism, but as an objective necessity, a natural outcome of socialism's historic victories in international relations and in the contemporary class and national liberation struggle. Today socialism's positions are so powerful that imperialism cannot expect to attain its aims by unleashing an armed conflict. Realising this the more farsighted

capitalist politicians are compelled to accept the alternative of peaceful coexistence which the Communists have been proposing ever since the establishment of the world's first socialist state.

The socialist countries look upon peaceful coexistence as the most natural form of competition and struggle between the states with opposite social systems.

Marxists-Leninists never absolutised the role and significance of armed strength. They have been and continue to be the principled opponents of the so-called export of revolution. A socialist revolution in any country takes place as a result of internal class contradictions inherent in an exploiter society; it is not necessary for Marxists-Leninists to impose their ideas by force of arms. Economics, politics, ideology and culture comprise the vast field in which the struggle against capitalism takes place. Peaceful coexistence, whose principles the ruling circles of a bourgeois state are now compelled to accept, creates the best conditions for coordinating the efforts of all the socialist and non-aligned countries precisely in these directions of the struggle.

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is not the concern of the Great Powers alone. "Now that the international climate has begun to improve," said Leonid Brezhnev, "dozens of states, big, medium-size and small, are becoming more active in their policies and striving to make their own contribution to the common cause of consolidating peace. There are many illustrations of this in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And it needs no argument to prove that the constructive contributions of any state merit equal respect, attentive and cordial response. Any attempts in this respect to contrast the 'great' or even the 'super' powers (as some have put it) with medium-size or small countries are absolutely unjustified, unnecessary and even harmful."*

The success of the cause of peace and security of the peoples further strengthens the links between the socialist and the liberated countries and between socialism and the national liberation movement, and heightens their role in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism.

International detente is not merely a matter of normalising and improving relations between capitalist and socialist states. It does not signify that the Soviet Union and the other coun-

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 232.

tries of the socialist community have deviated from their traditional friendship and cooperation with the young national states in the direction of capitalism, nor does it mean, contrary to the assertions of the opponents of peaceful coexistence, that the common interests of socialism and the national liberation movement in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism have been relegated to oblivion. "We know full well and always bear in mind," Leonid Brezhnev observed, "that, together with the peoples of the socialist countries, the peoples of the Asian, African and Latin American states form an important contingent, so to speak, of the standing army of peace in international relations. Together we have accomplished a great deal, and we are convinced that our ways will not part. The Soviet Union, for its part, prepared to take all the measures necessary to strengthen and develop our co-operation." *

A very important component of the Soviet Peace Programme is the all-round strengthening of the time-tested friendship of the socialist countries with the liberated states. Together with all the peoples of the world the peoples of the developing countries stand to gain from the consolidation of the principles of peace, security and cooperation in international relations. This has always been clear to the peoples of these countries and their more farsighted leaders who back in 1955 at a conference in Bandung formulated the universally known ten principles of peaceful coexistence spearheaded against the "cold war" policy and the policy of "local wars", and against the aggressive policy of "containing" and "throwing back" liberation movements which was pursued by the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, France and Portugal in their efforts to preserve their colonial empires. More than twenty years have elapsed. The world has changed beyond recognition in this period, so much so that the opponents of the non-alignment policy who considered it "immoral" and the opponents of the policy of peaceful coexistence having sustained a series of major defeats (in Algeria, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau and other countries) were compelled by the force and logic of history to embark on a new course in international relations.

Under the conditions of international detente the liberated countries are in a position more effectively to resolve controversial issues in international economic relations in

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 207-08.

which they still play an unequal and, at times, even a secondary role. They can take greater advantage of the growing opportunities for trading with the two world social systems and increasingly avail themselves of the cooperation with and economic assistance from the socialist countries thus forcing the capitalist countries into making concessions. The normalisation of international political relations has also stimulated economic activity and the influx of funds into Asian and African countries. And if the cold war disappears altogether and detente becomes an irreversible, constant factor in international relations, which is what the socialist community and all peace-loving countries are working for, if it proves possible considerably to slow down and then completely stop the arms race, involving both strategic and conventional weapons, and switch at least a part of the vast sums expended on armaments to creative purposes, one can expect a substantial increase in the funds allocated by international organisations and individual countries to finance the development of economically backward regions. The Soviet Union has already tabled a concrete proposal to deduct a part of the funds released as a result of a 10 per cent cut on the military expenditures of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, and use it to help the most indigent peoples.

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems also paves the way for a just settlement of the acute political conflicts disturbing the liberated countries. In a situation of peace, international cooperation, mutual respect, sovereignty and territorial integrity any manifestation of aggression and exploitation and any effort to suppress the national liberation movement are particularly intolerable. Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is by no means an appeal to the peoples who are fighting against colonialism and racialism to abandon or weaken their efforts to achieve liberation. On the contrary, the new international situation stimulates the anti-imperialist struggle ensuring that it is supported in every way by the full weight of the prestige enjoyed by the socialist countries, the solidarity of world democratic opinion and international law.

With the end of the armed imperialist intervention in Indochina priority is being given to the elimination of other, still existing manifestations of aggression and exploitation. In the first place it is necessary to resolve the Middle East crisis on the basis of the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and the

elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression. The USSR has always worked for a lasting peace in that part of the world through the restoration of the rights of the Arab peoples which have been trampled upon by the aggressor, and respect for the sovereignty of all states there, and for strengthening the position of the progressive Arab states which are striving in complicated conditions to pursue a socialist-oriented policy. Only the diehard enemies of socialism and the Arab peoples falsely assert that the USSR has withdrawn its support for the liberation movement of the Arab peoples. The stand of the USSR and the entire socialist community towards the current course of events in that part of the world was expounded in a speech delivered by Leonid Brezhnev at the 11th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party: "The Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries always work vigorously and consistently for the establishment of a really lasting and really equitable peace in the Middle East and for the surest road towards this — the early resumption of the work of the Geneva Conference, which was set up for this purpose, for the settlement of the basic problems — the liberation of all Arab lands occupied in 1967, the satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine up to and including their right to statehood, for an effective guarantee to all the Middle East states of a secure, independent and free existence and development." *

Universal peace in Asia also depends on the further strengthening of peace, cooperation and the security of all the peoples of the South Asian subcontinent. The assertion of the international law principles, including the right to self-determination and the establishment of independent national states, creates an atmosphere of universal intolerance of and protest against the blatantly illegal acts of genocide and aggression that are perpetrated by the colonialists and racialists of Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa. They know that international law puts them totally outside the system of normal political relations of international cooperation and trade. Such, precisely, are the demands contained in numerous UN decisions on boycotting these countries. The struggle of the African peoples is receiving a fresh stimulus and increasing support from the progressive forces, and their victory under the new conditions is a foregone conclusion.

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 547.

The changes which are taking place in the international climate under the impact of the peaceful initiative of the socialist countries open fresh prospects for the development of constructive cooperation between the forces of socialism and national liberation fighters and strengthens the positions of the world anti-imperialist front, of socialism, peace, social progress and democracy.

The favourable opportunities created by the new international climate for the further consolidation of the friendship between the socialist community and the liberated countries and their cohesion on a consistently anti-imperialist foundation, will tend to strengthen peace and the security of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. This is essential for ensuring the actual independence of the liberated countries, the introduction of progressive socio-economic reforms and the strengthening of their progressive political forces.

The opponents of peaceful coexistence express the will of the imperialist monopolies which are most interested in sustaining the arms race, of the leading circles of the imperialist blocs which are afraid that the improvement of the international climate might weaken their positions in the competitive struggle, and of those leaders who place their great power, hegemonistic aims above the interests of peace.

The enemies of peace and war mongers in both the imperialist and chauvinistic garb are making very determined efforts to spread the altogether slanderous and false thesis about a "conspiracy of the super-powers" at the expense of the liberated countries. They are intent on proving that which simply cannot be proved, namely, that these countries are interested in a deterioration of Soviet-American relations, in seeing the "cold war" between the USSR and the USA continue and subsequently deepen and develop into a global conflict. This stand adopted by the imperialist hawks is advantageous to the provocative elements in the international adventuristic circles which want to deceive world public opinion and the peoples of the liberated countries so that they would initiate a foreign policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community.

The utter futility of such a policy of military gambles, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism is more than obvious. The USSR and the entire socialist community have always been and will remain the staunch friends and allies of all the liberated countries and peoples fighting for national independence.

Consistently implementing the Peace Programme, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government attach great importance to strengthening peace and creating a reliable security system in Asia. This policy is based on highly principled, and not transient considerations and on the vast historical experience of the Soviet Union in the struggle for security in Asia.

Two-thirds of the Soviet Union lie in Asia. Russia, as Lenin noted, geographically, economically and historically belongs not only to Europe but to Asia, too. And that accounts for the fact that since the first days of its existence the Soviet state has been paying the most serious attention to Asian problems.

A precarious, explosion-fraught situation has persisted in Asia since the Second World War. Seats of tension and war appeared one after another in various parts of this enormous continent, and it was the scene of local military conflicts. There were the US aggression in Korea, the three-power imperialist aggression against Egypt, the Indian-Pakistani and Indian-Chinese conflicts, Israel's protracted aggression against the Arab states, etc. Imperialism's aggressive war against the heroic Vietnamese people continued for decades and Laos and Kampuchea were also the victims of aggression.

At different times some Asian countries were inveigled into the SEATO, CENTO, ASPAC and ANZUS military and political blocs which are instruments for disuniting the continent's countries and stand in the way of the independent development of the national states.

Since the Second World War the USSR declared time and again that closed military groupings have outlived themselves and could be replaced by a reliable system of security. But owing to counteraction by the imperialist states the idea of collective defence of peace in Asia was not taken up at the time.

In recent years, under the impact of the general shift in the balance of forces in the world, conditions have begun to take shape on the Asian continent which are objectively favourable for executing a shift in the direction of normalising the situation in that part of the world and creating a reliable system of peace and security of the peoples. The independent Asian states which, having thrown off the capitalist yoke, are now in a position to determine their own future and policy, have enhanced their prestige and influence. The Asian countries, which are

busy strengthening their political and economic independence, are aware that the success of their creative efforts will be short-lived if lasting peace is not established on the continent.

In this respect a tremendous role is played by the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which consistently work for the consolidation of peace and the promotion of friendly relations with the Asian countries and assist their progressive forces in the struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

Taking into consideration the new alignment of forces in the modern world as a whole and in Asia in particular, the Soviet Union back in 1969 put forward the idea of setting up a system of collective security in Asia. Expounding the substance of this proposal, Leonid Brezhnev in his speech at the 15th Congress of the Soviet Trade Unions noted: "Collective security in Asia must, in our view, be based on such principles as repudiation of the use of force in relations between states, respect for the sovereignty and inviolability of frontiers, non-interference in internal affairs, and broad development of economic and other co-operation on the basis of complete equality and mutual benefit. We advocate and shall continue to advocate such collective security in Asia and are ready to co-operate with all countries to make this idea a reality."*

As he addressed the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow in 1973, Leonid Brezhnev referred to the consolidation of peace in the Asian continent by collective effort. He said: "We conceive of this as the progressive development of all aspects of mutually beneficial and mutually enriching relations and peaceful co-operation between all the Asian countries, as the consolidation in these relations of the well-known principles proclaimed by the Asian countries at Bandung of peaceful coexistence with strict observance of the sovereignty and independence of each country."**

The fundamental ideas, underlying the Soviet proposal concerning Asian security, is its collective nature and the equal participation of all Asian states regardless of their size or social system. Naturally, the participation of the People's Republic of China would have contributed to the solution of such a cardinal question as the consolidation of peace and security in Asia. As regards the USSR, it would have welcomed

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 31.

** Ibid., p. 314.

China's participation in steps aimed at strengthening Asian security,* said Leonid Brezhnev in his speech at the World Congress of Peace Forces.

The main principle of Asian and for that matter of world-wide security is repudiation of the threat and use of force in inter-state relations. If it is not implemented it will be impossible to prevent acts of aggression and to reject wars as a means of resolving controversies and conflicts. This principle has already been incorporated into bilateral agreements signed by some Asian states, and the time has come to implement it throughout Asia.

One of the basic aims of collective security in Asia is to protect the Asian states not only against the threat of war and aggression, but also against encroachments on their sovereignty and territorial integrity, and close the door to foreign intervention into their internal affairs. The strict observance of the principle of non-interference does much to ensure the free development of states and peoples.

For a long time the imperialist intervention in Indochina was a major obstacle to the creation of an atmosphere of peace and security in Asia. Now the way is open. The struggle for peace and security in the Asian continent should go hand in hand with efforts to eliminate the aftermath of the Israeli aggression against the Arab states and regulate the Middle East conflict on the basis of the relevant UN decision.

The idea of building a reliable system of peace and security in Asia implies also the expansion of economic and other cooperation between the Asian states on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Broad cooperation, particularly economic, will enable the Asian states more fully to avail themselves of the international division of labour on the continent and in the world as a whole. The Asian peoples need peace so as not to squander their resources and efforts on conflicts, but to place them wholly at the service of economic and social progress.

By acting altogether for the sake of peace and security on the whole continent, the Asian peoples will be able to struggle more actively against neocolonialism, for the genuinely independent development of their national states and for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy and social progress in Asia.

In this respect it is most important to promote good-neighbourly relations between states on a bilateral or regional basis.

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 314.

Being in the interests of each Asian country and designed to strengthen the peace, such relations create favourable conditions for collective efforts in this direction. The treaties signed in their time by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Asia and also the Soviet Union's treaties with India and Iraq serve this purpose.

This means that the Soviet proposal concerning the establishment of a reliable system of collective security in Asia lays the foundation for a new system of inter-state relations resting on mutual understanding and trust which, in the final analysis, should ensure the triumph of the principles of peaceful coexistence on the Asian continent.

The Soviet Union's initiative has evoked a broad response and increasing support from the Asian countries. The desire to build inter-state relations on the basis of new principles—respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of states, repudiation of the use of force to resolve controversial issues, non-interference in internal affairs and recognition of peaceful coexistence, mutual understanding and trust—is now manifested not only by the socialist and non-aligned countries and Communist and progressive parties and organisations in the Asian countries, but also by some states which are members of military and political blocs.

The Soviet initiative is eliciting support in India and is regarded with great interest in Japan. Questions concerning Asian security are extensively discussed in Malaysia, Singapore and other countries in the continent. All this shows that the idea of Asian security is becoming more and more topical and is attracting increasing attention on the part of the ruling circles and the broad public in the Asian countries.

There are facts proving that the quest for security is gaining momentum in Asia, and various plans designed to ensure regional security have been put forward. At conferences in Lusaka in 1970 and in Colombo in 1976 the heads of state and government of non-aligned states spoke in favour of turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. The members of the Association of Southeast Asia Countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines) in 1971 adopted a resolution on turning Southeast Asia into a neutral zone. Other proposals close to the idea of Asian security are also being voiced.

Although conditions in Asia are complicated as a result of the imperialist intrigues and differences between the Asian

states, the idea of establishing a reliable system of peace and security is making a way for itself on the continent. This is all the more important because it is opposed by external reactionary forces and chauvinistic and militaristic circles in certain Asian countries. Some newspapers in Western and Asian countries allege that the Soviet idea of strengthening security in Asia is nothing more than an attempt on the part of the USSR to "fill the vacuum" which is created by the withdrawal of the United States, Britain and other powers from Asia. This "argument" is an attempt to place the Soviet Union, which invariably upholds the national liberation, anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of Asia, on the same plane with the imperialist powers, which for decades and centuries had oppressed the Asian peoples and now act as neocolonialists towards them.

The Soviet idea of building collective security in Asia is not new, Leonid Brezhnev said at a jubilee meeting in Ulan Bator on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Mongolian People's Republic. Many of the principles on which it could rest have been proclaimed in a number of international documents concerning Asia. For instance, the purpose of the ten principles approved at the Bandung Conference in 1955 was to turn Asia and Africa into continents of peace and cooperation. At their fourth conference which took place in Algiers, the non-aligned states also formulated important proposals directed at strengthening peace in Asia. "Thus," said Leonid Brezhnev, "the idea of ensuring Asian security and cooperation by collective effort is the outcome of the political experience and questing of many states. To implement this idea, consistent and persevering practical measures will have to be taken by many states, and attentive consideration given to many different views and positions."*

The opponents of the creation of Asian security system are endeavouring to misrepresent the substance of the Soviet idea and portray it as a manifestation of the Soviet Union's desire to set up "blocs" and of its "hostility" towards certain Asian countries, China in particular.

Time and again the Soviet Union made it clear that its idea is not directed against any state whatsoever. It envisages the joint participation of the Asian countries in ensuring equal security for all countries and peoples and is designed to turn Asia into a continent of peace and cooperation.

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 532.

The creation of stable security for all the Asian peoples by collective effort is a complicated task, and a certain period of time will have to elapse before all the difficulties are surmounted. Yet it is a realistic aim, since the majority of the Asian countries are interested in normalising the situation on the continent.

Lastly, it is necessary to take into account the great force of the example set by the European countries in ensuring their security and cooperation. In the 20th century alone Europe within a mere three decades (from 1914 to 1945) was immersed in two world wars of attrition which involved all the continents of the globe. It cannot be said that Europe today knows no national, social, class or economic contradictions and that it has no unresolved ethnic or territorial problems. And yet European countries and even the United States and Canada voluntarily, on the basis of mutually acceptable principles and mutual benefit, reached a firm agreement on the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, on respect for sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, on the repudiation of the use or the threat of force and on the promotion of economic, commercial and cultural cooperation for the benefit of all the peoples of Europe. Of course, it now remains to translate these commitments into life. But it should be acknowledged that they have set a splendid example which should be applied in Asia in line with the concrete situation on the continent.

The shift in the correlation of forces in the world in favour of socialism, the broad international recognition of one of the key principles of the Leninist foreign policy — the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, marked progress in ensuring European security, the trend towards detente throughout the world, and the strengthening solidarity of the forces of world socialism, the national liberation movement and all peace champions, are factors which create favourable conditions for the invigoration of efforts to build peace and collective security in Asia.

The Soviet Government, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the socialist community and all peace-loving peoples are definitely raising the aggregate of problems connected with the establishment of collective security in Asia to a higher state and public level, and are showing the peoples of the world once again that this idea is not only honest, just and effective and acceptable to all the Asian states, but that it actually can be translated into reality.

The Revolutionary Process in Asian and African Countries

In his prodigious activity to perfect the socialist "international revolution against imperialism" * the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state V. I. Lenin constantly addressed himself to the peoples of the East where he anticipated a mighty revolutionary wave which would eventually sweep away the system of colonial exploitation. "The period of the awakening of the East in the contemporary revolution," he said, "is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world, so as not to be simply objects of the enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, the need for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind." **

The forces of protest were only just beginning to mature in the vast expanses of Asia and Africa, but Lenin was already regarding the anti-colonial movements as a volcano which would discharge a lava of hatred for imperialism as more and more peoples rising for the struggle for freedom and independence would emerge on the world political scene. Lenin defined the direction and the historical perspective of the anti-colonial movements and their place in the world revolutionary process. He established that by opposing exploi-

* V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 317.

** V. I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 160.

tation and undermining imperialist domination, they were acting in the same direction as the first victorious socialist revolution, which vastly stimulated the national liberation struggle, and the activity of the working class in the industrialised capitalist countries, and were their natural ally. He had a high opinion of the revolutionary-democratic potential of the national liberation movements, stressed the role played by the toiling masses in these movements and predicted that they could shift to anti-capitalist positions. Hence his fundamental tenet about a firm alliance of the forces of socialism and the national liberation movement for their common benefit. "Our Soviet republic," he said, "must now muster all the awakening peoples of the East and, together with them, wage a struggle against international imperialism."*

In those distant years following the October Revolution the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia and Africa had only just entered its decisive stage. Contacts between the victorious socialist revolution and the Eastern countries were historically limited both by the narrow opportunities of the young Soviet state and the low level of the revolutionary movement of the Asian and African peoples. Yet it was in that period that Lenin formulated the basic principles of the Communists' policy on the national and colonial questions.

Lenin developed a range of general methodological principles of the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties which have since been verified and tested by practice and are now of universal significance and extend to all stages and zones of the anti-imperialist revolutionary process. These principles include his demand that the Communists should be loyal to the banner of proletarian internationalism; work "*wherever the masses are to be found*"**; bring up the masses on the basis of their own political experience; consistently struggle for winning over mass allies from the non-proletarian exploited classes; build up a united front of anti-imperialist forces whose composition would depend on the nature of a given stage of the revolutionary process; play a vanguard role in democratic and anti-imperialist revolutions; take advantage of the political division of the ruling classes; take into ac-

* Ibid., p. 161.

** V. I. Lenin, "'Left-Wing' Communism — an Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 53.

count the actual level of the masses' awareness and the local conditions; resolutely refrain from premature, unprepared actions which could lead to the mass annihilation of the working people and slow down the revolution; and preserve and uphold the political independence of the Communists.

Lenin based his key methodological conclusions in the field of the scientific principles of communist strategy and tactics on the Marxist theory and on an analysis of the worldwide socio-economic and political processes occurring in the epoch of moribund capitalism. As applicable to the East these conclusions acquired and continue to acquire a specific form, but this by no means narrows the field of their implementation. Thus, in the colonial East the principle of giving priority to the attainment of a strategic objective corresponding to the developing stage of the revolutionary process, was realised in the policy of a united national anti-imperialist front, while the principle of taking account of the actual level of the political awareness of the working people found its expression among other things in the maximum circumspection in the approach to deeply-rooted religious and national convictions. Lenin's methodological instructions concerning the nature and the tasks of the Communist parties and their strategic and tactical principles for the entire historical period of the transition to socialism, have always been and continue to be of fundamental significance for the fighters for independence and social progress both in the industrialised capitalist societies and in the oppressed countries.

Lenin established that when capitalism entered its final stage—the epoch of imperialism—the world became divided into the oppressor and the oppressed nations, with the population of the imperialism-oppressed countries comprising an overwhelming majority of mankind. By fighting for its liberation the world proletariat also fights for the interests of the peoples exploited by imperialism. These peoples awaken to vigorous political activity and rise to an anti-imperialist struggle, which is a progressive process of world historic importance. This mass of the oppressed people comprises one of the three colossal world forces fighting against imperialism and also including the working class of the oppressor countries and the Soviet state, the only country of the victorious proletarian revolution which existed during Lenin's lifetime. Being the offspring of the world proletariat, the Soviet Union is in the vanguard of the drive against imperial-

ism. The two other anti-imperialist forces are rallied round it.

In the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, as a result of the victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia and its impact on the world revolutionary process, an organised communist movement emerged in the oppressed countries. Lenin taught the young Communists of the East to adhere to the scientific theory and general methodological instructions of Marxist strategy and tactics, take the local conditions into account, form the advanced detachments of the proletariat—Communist parties and groups—and set about resolving the most important and necessary task, that of creating mass organisations of the labouring people, organising the class struggle of the workers and peasants, combining scientific socialism with the proletarian movement and propagandising its ideas in the broad masses, and in a most consistent and determined manner work for the development of a democratic (anti-imperialist and anti-feudal) stage of the revolution in these countries. Lenin set the Communists of the East the following tasks: to establish links between the liberation struggle of millions of working people in the colonies and semicolonies and the international communist movement, the Soviet Land and the working-class movement in the metropolitan countries; to build correct political relations with the peasants comprising the bulk of the population in the oppressed countries and work actively to turn them into an ally of the proletariat; to give priority to the anti-imperialist strategic objective in combination with orientation towards non-capitalist development; to enter into political alliances with national-revolutionary and bourgeois-democratic forces, above all with the view to “breaking through” to the masses following these forces; and, finally (he advanced this task with especial clarity and consistency), to win, uphold and unconditionally preserve the political independence of the working-class and communist movement and its class independence in alliances with non-proletarian, anti-imperialist forces.*

* The range of tasks facing the Communists in the oppressed countries and the international communist movement as a whole are expounded in some of Lenin's works and in the documents of the Communist International, which were drawn up under Lenin's guidance. See: V. I. Lenin, “Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East. November 22, 1919”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30; “Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31; “Better Fewer, But Better”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33

A very important place in the general system of Lenin's tactical and strategic instructions concerning the policy of the Communists in the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is occupied by the problem of the socialist perspective of the economically backward countries, its links with the prospect for a worldwide revolutionary process, its distinguishing features and the attitude of the Communists to other progressive forces that are capable of playing a positive role in surmounting the capitalist development of the Eastern countries.

Lenin did not connect the possibility of the oppressed countries bypassing capitalism as a social formation directly with the assumption of power by their Communist parties. He proved that given the assistance and cooperation of the international working class and above all of the country of the victorious proletariat it would be possible to bypass capitalist development as a result of the struggle of mass popular organisations in whose formation and activity the Communists should play a most active part (and in those conditions this was their vital task). Under a political system resting on mass organisations of the labouring people, the backward countries can come to communism after passing "through certain stages of development". Lenin listed the conditions for non-capitalist development: formation of "independent contingents of fighters and party organisations"; activity of mass people's organisations, including the peasant Soviets; assistance of the victorious proletariat.*

The fact that capitalism continued to develop in the oppressed countries did not alter the fundamental presentation of the problem of the possibility of non-capitalist development, for nowhere in Asia and Africa (with the exception of Japan) did capitalism become predominant, although in the past half a century it had moved into a leading position in some

and other Lenin's works. See also the relevant documents of the Second Congress of the Comintern in the book *V. I. Lenin and the Communist International*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 198-204 (in Russian); on the "first and foremost task" of the Communists of the East—the creation of mass non-party organisations of the working people—see V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 242-44, and also *V. I. Lenin and the Communist International*, p. 204 (in Russian).

* V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

countries. Dwelling on the possibility of avoiding or curtailing the capitalist stage of development, Lenin did not mention any group of particularly backward countries. He had in mind countries whose economies were dominated by pre-capitalist relations, and outlined the idea of creating mass popular organisations everywhere, in the "backward and colonial countries" included (it was a question not only of the borderlands of the former tsarist empire, but also of the colonies of the Western imperialist powers), among the "backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war".* Neither did he make an exception for such a relatively developed country as India (by the way, many Eastern countries have not even now attained the level of India's development in 1920; according to the League of Nations statistics India was then one of the ten leading industrial countries of the world). Features that were common to all the countries which Lenin had mentioned were imperialist oppression and domination of pre-capitalist relations (in spite of a "certain advance towards progress" that was to be seen). Hence when Lenin spoke of "bypassing" capitalism, he did so in a broad sense that included the concept of "interrupting" the development of capitalism, i.e. of substantially shortening its stages.

Life confirmed his prediction. Eventually countries with different levels of the maturity of capitalist relations reoriented themselves towards socialism. What was common to all these countries in this respect was that they were undergoing a process of primary capitalist accumulation, the formation of a capitalist manufacturing industry, the growth of commercial and money-lending capital, the compradore bourgeoisie and the initial phases of industrial development, and that the capitalist structure was not predominant in any of them. So far as such a situation persists in one or another economically backward country, the door to non-capitalist development is by no means closed to her. But a possibility is not a reality, and the fact that Lenin established that economically backward countries had the possibility to bypass capitalism did not in the least signify that he regarded this road as the only one and therefore universal and that all such countries would take it. On the other hand, the fact that so far only a relatively

* Ibid., pp. 243, 244.

small number of countries are advancing along the non-capitalist road on no account implies that historical development is already closing this road for the liberated countries.

Lenin's theory of non-capitalist development enlarged upon the teaching about the world historic role of the proletariat in the conditions of a new alignment and a new correlation of socio-political forces on a global scale. In keeping with this theory Lenin further developed the strategy of the international communist movement in the national and colonial questions. In his opinion the revolutionary working class in the industrialised Western countries and Russia's victorious proletariat in the first place were to help the toiling people of the oppressed countries to shift to the new, non-capitalist road. The Communists in these countries were to start work in the mass popular organisations and exercise their influence upon them, prompting and cultivating "an urge for independent political thinking and independent political action"* among the masses. At certain stages of development in the course of the shift from regimes guided by revolutionary non-communist organisations to socialism, the working class was to play an increasing role and the socialist reorganisation of society would take place on the basis of scientific socialism.

It is the growth of its influence on an international scale that opens the prospect of non-capitalist development. These propositions concretised the strategic course of the international communist movement aimed at drawing the peoples of the oppressed countries into a "socialist international revolution against imperialism", with due account of the new historical opportunity of the oppressed countries, that of taking the non-capitalist road. This opportunity presented itself only after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution when the international communist movement became an influential force.

Lenin fought against the revisionist, sectarian misinterpretation of the communist policy in the East. He set forth one of his most important instructions in this connection in the twelfth, the last thesis of his "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions" for the Second Congress of the Communist International. In it he

* V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 243.

noted that it was the "duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries to regard with particular caution and attention the survivals of national sentiments in the countries and among nationalities which have been oppressed the longest; it is equally necessary to make certain concessions with a view to more rapidly overcoming this distrust and these prejudices".* He proceeded from the fact that the centuries-long imperialist oppression had imbued the working masses of the oppressed countries with distrust not only of the oppressor nations in general, but also of their proletariat; that small agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation lent particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices—national egoism and national narrowness. In his opinion lack of caution and flexibility with regard to the national sentiments and religious beliefs of the labouring masses of the oppressed peoples was pregnant with the danger of a leftist misinterpretation of the united front policy in the East.

He also warned against the course of "exporting revolution" into the Eastern countries which the young national-revolutionaries of the East, as well as the Trotskyites, tried to impose on the Communist International and the CPSU (then called the Russian Communist Party [Bolsheviks]).** Lenin adopted a totally different attitude to the question of rendering military assistance to the Communists in foreign countries: he considered that it would be possible only "if it actually was a question of revolution",*** in other words, if it was a question of the already formed internal conditions essential for the victory of the developing revolution and upholding its gains in one or another country.

Lenin and the Communist International considered it necessary to assist the forces waging national-revolutionary liberation wars. The Soviet Government furnished such assistance to the Turkish people in their struggle against the Entente in 1920-1922, to Iranian and Afghan revolutionaries

* V. I. Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 151.

** For these attempts by Trotsky which were rebuffed in 1919 by the Central Committee of the CPSU, see *Second Congress of the Comintern, Development by the Congress of the Ideological, Tactical and Organisational Principles of the Communist Parties*, Moscow, 1972, p. 32 (in Russian); on Lenin's sharp criticism of the views of the Trotskyites (Preobrazhensky and others) see *Kommunist*, No. 5, 1968, pp. 39-40.

*** Ibid., p. 30.

who rose up in arms against British imperialism, and to the Chinese anti-imperialists. This was a great contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. The Bolshevik Party and the Communist International regarded their internationalist duty to assist the peoples fighting against colonialism, and considered such assistance as fundamentally different from the "export of revolution" which they vigorously rejected.

In Lenin's opinion a united front policy could also be distorted by hasty, groundless proposals concerning the organisation of Communist parties in the economically backward countries which lacked an adequate proletarian basis (including in the states which at that time had started to advance along the non-capitalist road).^{*} He did not rule out the possibility that such intentions reflected efforts to "put a new communist colouring" to the national liberation revolutions and that they constituted a harmful and dangerous trend towards "changing the signboard". At the same time he clearly visualised the emergence of Communist parties in connection with the rise and development of the working class whose foremost representatives were destined to form the party's proletarian Marxist nucleus.

There was also the danger of a nationalistic distortion of the united anti-imperialist front policy which was expressed in the absolutisation of the "Eastern route" of the world revolutionary process. Lenin pointed to this threat as far back as at the Second Congress of the Comintern when it had just advanced the idea of the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces. It is clear from the materials of the work of the Congress commission on July 25, 1920 that Lenin resolutely and consistently opposed this nationalistic danger.

In the course of the struggle for a united front in the East repeated attempts were undertaken to revise Lenin's very important conclusions that it was necessary for the Communists to enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democrats in the oppressed countries, but at the same time unfailingly to preserve the political independence of their movement, and also that the colonial bourgeois democracy could, in principle, shift to revolutionary anti-imperialist positions. Some of these attempts were an understandable

^{*} See V. I. Lenin, "Talk with a Delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 361.

and even natural reaction on the part of the young, inexperienced Communists to the selfish, conciliatory and at times directly treacherous policy of the right wing of the Eastern bourgeois democracy.

As regards the Trotskyites, they tried to counter Lenin's line of forming a united anti-imperialist front with their "permanent revolution" scheme in its Eastern variant. The Trotskyite approach to the prospects of the revolutionary movement in the East was also antipodal to Lenin's. In the most general terms it amounted to the following: bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the Eastern countries which have a proletariat, allegedly do not at all differ from the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia; the national bourgeoisie of the East cannot and will not participate in a revolution and will promptly come out as a counter-revolutionary force; the fact that imperialism oppresses the East does not introduce any specific features into the position of the bourgeoisie—the Russian bourgeoisie had its contradictions with the autocracy but that did not prevent it from becoming the latter's handmaiden (in this scheme imperialism is simply likened with autocracy); hence a general national (with the participation of the bourgeoisie) stage of the revolution in China or India, or in any other colonial country, would allegedly be impossible; a policy of forming a bloc with the national-bourgeois circles in the East, the Trotskyites declared, was a Menshevik policy. Thus false premises—the negation of the specific character of the Eastern revolutions as revolutions which in the first place were anti-colonial and anti-imperialist; the negation of the crucial significance of the agrarian question and the need to form a bloc with the anti-feudal peasantry; the notion that the socio-economic backwardness of the colonial countries allegedly strengthens the positions of the proletariat; and the underestimation of the anti-imperialist potentialities of the national bourgeoisie—gave rise to the wrong conclusion that the countries of the East were standing directly on the threshold of a socialist revolution. The international communist movement resolutely rejected this scheme, and life showed that Trotskyite ideas were unfounded and harmful.

* * *

As he formulated the Comintern's strategy in the national-colonial question, Lenin arrived at conclusions which were of cardinal importance. He pointed out, and we should like to

repeat this, that Soviet Russia would turn into a centre round which the liberation movements, those in the oppressed countries in the first place, would rally; that there was an objective need and possibility for the unification of the world anti-imperialist forces headed by international socialism; that it was imperative to preserve the independence of the proletarian parties in the East and to secure the broad development of non-party, non-communist anti-imperialist organisations of the masses; that the anti-imperialist movement would overgrow into an anti-capitalist movement; that the peasants of the oppressed countries would have to play a major role in the ensuing stages of the world revolutionary process; that in the new, post-October conditions, it was possible for the backward countries to move towards socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development, and that there also existed the possibility of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and their development into socialist revolutions under the guidance of Marxist-Leninist parties.

These key conclusions became the programme of action of the international communist movement vis-à-vis the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples which Marxists-Leninists viewed as an inalienable part of the world revolutionary process. It followed these guidelines also during the activity of the historically determined organisational union of the Communist parties—the Communist International, and in the subsequent epoch. An earnest of the great victories scored by the forces of peace, democracy and socialism with the Communists as their vanguard, was loyalty to Lenin's behests and, in particular, to his assessments of and instructions about the prospects of the development of the revolutionary process in the East and the policy of the Communists in the oppressed regions of the world, the instructions which he put forward in the pre-October period and in the first years following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The international communist movement and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union creatively developed the theory and strategy of scientific communism on the basis of Lenin's principles and with due consideration for the changes that took place in the objective situation and the new tasks that emerged as a result. The building of socialism in the USSR under the conditions of capitalist encirclement and the revolutionary upsurge in the industrialised capitalist countries

and also in the colonies and semi-colonies; the peoples' pre-war struggle against fascism; the military and political debacle of the bloc of fascist states; the rise and consolidation of the world socialist system; the collapse of the colonial empires; and the consolidation of the positions of socialism and the further development of the liberation struggle of the peoples under conditions of international detente—all these historic changes in the world confirmed and continue to confirm the correctness and the scientific nature of the political course of the CPSU and the international communist movement and, at the same time, were taken into account when this course was creatively formulated. They are being taken into account now, too. This is borne out by the decisions and conclusions adopted by such epochal forums of Communists as the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, the Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties and the CPSU Congresses.

* * *

Sixty years have passed since the Great October Socialist Revolution—one of the most momentous landmarks in the development of mankind and its truly greatest hour and achievement. The victory of Russia's working class led by the Leninist Party produced an unprecedentedly powerful generator of the world revolutionary process which has been irrepressibly developing ever since. The revolution in Russia sundered the chain of imperialism and the Soviet people after smashing the internal and external counter-revolution started building a socialist society. A worldwide offensive against imperialism got under way which, starting with October 1917, began to lose one position after another. Since then the world has changed irreversibly. The Soviet people have built a developed socialist society and are successfully advancing towards communism. A world socialist system has come into being. Colonial empires have ceased to exist. The international communist movement has turned into an influential political force. The giant, historically important process of the fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the liberation movement of the working people is acquiring ever greater scope. The working-class movement is strengthening and the class battles of the working people in the industrialised capitalist countries are gaining in scope and scale. Some of the liberated countries, with a total population of 150 million—in

Asia, Africa and Latin America—have taken the path of socialist orientation. The law of the uneven development of countries lying within the orbit of imperialism is continuing to operate with irresistible force and tends to aggravate the internal contradictions of this doomed system; and its periphery, i.e. states which are subject to neocolonialist oppression, is hurling an economic and political challenge to imperialist domination. The anti-imperialist struggle has acquired a truly global scale, and with the powerful support of the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole is unfolding with mounting force. More and more countries and regions are breaking away from the world capitalist system, and the victory of the forces of socialism in Indochina is a fresh manifestation of this world historic trend.

“It is farthest from the Communists’ minds to predict an ‘automatic collapse’ of capitalism,” noted Leonid Brezhnev in the report to the 25th CPSU Congress. “It still has considerable reserves. Yet the developments of recent years forcefully confirm that capitalism is a society without a future.”* The climate of international detente, created to a very large extent by the efforts of the Leninist Party, is beneficial for mankind but not for capitalism, a system of exploitation and enslavement of the peoples. “We make no secret of the fact,” Leonid Brezhnev said, “that we see detente as the way to create more favourable conditions for peaceful socialist and communist construction. This only confirms that socialism and peace are indissoluble.”**

World socialism’s enormous progress since the October Socialist Revolution has been a result of the natural historical law of development of the human society, which was discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and which leads to the replacement of the capitalist system by the socialist one. This law is not a mechanistic one, and it paves the way for itself through socio-political practice, the collision of opposing interests and the class struggle, and this method of operation is also a regularity. A vastly significant role in the process of the socialist transformation of the world is played by the purposeful and conscious activity of the advanced class headed by Marxist-Leninist parties, and by their policy, strategy and

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 34.

** *Ibid.*, p. 39.

tactics. It was the science-based policy of the Communist parties, mankind's vanguard, that produced the irreversible changes in favour of socialism in such an historically short period of time. The point of departure for the increasing changes of this kind was the Great October Socialist Revolution whose victory was also ensured by a correct political course which was brilliantly formulated by Lenin and which is an example of the creative application of the theory of scientific socialism.

A political course can be successful only if it is based on an understanding of the laws of historical development, on a precise knowledge and scientific analysis of reality. "Only an objective consideration of the sum total of the relations between absolutely all the classes in a given society," Lenin wrote, "and consequently a consideration of the objective stage of development reached by that society and of the relations between it and other societies, can serve as a basis for the correct tactics of an advanced class."* A scientific definition of the aims of the struggle and an objective examination of the means and methods of attaining the set tasks, such is the principle of the Communists.

The further development of political strategy on the basis of scientific socialism with due account for the radical changes taking place in the world in the epoch of the struggle for its socialist transformation, such is the task of immense importance which is being solved by the efforts of all Marxist-Leninist parties. A major contribution to this common cause is being made by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee which undeviatingly adhere to Leninist principles in their entire activity. Marxism of the 20th century is the inviolable basis of the activity conducted by the CPSU.

Guided by Lenin's conclusions concerning the nature, significance and prospects of the national liberation movement, the CPSU always holds in its field of vision the diversity of the processes occurring in the Afro-Asian countries. Never before had the CPSU leadership faced the need to solve so many fundamentally new theoretical and practical problems of inter-state and inter-party relations, and define its attitude to such numerous and diverse political movements and parties. All this calls for unremitting attention on the part of the

* V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 75.

CPSU and the Soviet state. It is no accident that the problems of the developing countries and their relations with the USSR and the socialist community occupy a prominent place in the activity of the CPSU.

* * *

In its policy the CPSU undeviatingly adheres to Lenin's idea of an alliance between the USSR and the national liberation movements. General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Leonid Brezhnev carries this principle into reality with the utmost consistency and resolve. "The socialist countries where social and national oppression has been eliminated for ever, and the young states which have embarked on the road of independence and progressive orientation, are united by the common goals in the fundamental issues of the present-day international life. We are united by the struggle against imperialism and the commitment to the ideals of social progress,"* he said. "We are completely unanimous with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in that the last colonial regimes should be wiped out."** The CPSU takes into account the lasting community of interests of the Afro-Asian peoples and the peoples of the socialist countries, and this objective community creates a reliable basis for what Leonid Brezhnev described as "an inviolable friendship and unity of the two great forces of our time—world socialism and the countries which have liberated themselves from the colonial yoke and have embarked on the road of an independent progressive development."***

The CPSU is determined to take full advantage of the favourable objective opportunities for strengthening its links with African and Asian states and political movements. In the process, it invariably comes up against counter-measures by the imperialists and reactionary forces, and against provocations and anti-communist propaganda. "The imperialists are straining every effort to pull apart socialism and the national liberation movement which fuse into a single revolu-

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom* (Following Lenin's Course), Vol. 5, Moscow, 1976, p. 35.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *O vneshnei politike KPSS i Sovetskogo gosudarstva. Rech'i i statyi* (On Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State. Speeches and Articles), Moscow, 1973, p. 9.

*** *Pravda*, June 9, 1976.

tionary torrent. But the peoples of the young national states are beginning to distinguish who are their friends and who are their enemies, though the latter try to mask their colonialist aims.”* The CPSU regards it as its goal to ensure firm unity of action of the forces of socialism and national liberation on the basis of their common interests and to counterpose it to the divisive policy of the imperialist and reactionary circles. Leonid Brezhnev drew attention to the exceptional importance of this task in a Message to the participants in the 12th Session of the Council of the Organisation of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia and Africa: “Under these conditions still greater importance attaches to the unity of action of the countries of world socialism and of the national liberation movement, of the developing countries, which are natural allies both in the struggle for the freedom and independence of all peoples and for the equal cooperation of all countries, for a peaceful future of mankind.”** It is a question of turning potential opportunities into reality, raising the cooperation of the socialist and developing countries to a higher level and lending it a previously unheard-of width, scope and permanency by creating lasting communication links and a mechanism of working cooperation. Leonid Brezhnev’s meetings and correspondence with the heads of Afro-Asian states and representatives of political parties and movements, his numerous appeals to international conferences on Afro-Asian problems, not to mention his continuous guidance of the foreign policy of the Party and the state, have won him universal recognition as a convinced, staunch and consistent fighter for the further rapprochement of the socialist community with the peoples who had thrown off the colonial yoke, as a man wholly dedicated to the cause of implementing Lenin’s revolutionary idea of rallying all the oppressed peoples of the world round the Soviet Union.

It is quite natural that a theoretical comprehension of economic, social and political processes in the liberated countries occupies an important place in the multisided activity of the CPSU. Leonid Brezhnev’s contribution in this sphere is very considerable. The CC reports at CPSU Congresses, his speeches at the forums of the international communist move-

* L. I. Brezhnev, *O vneshnei politike KPSS i Sovetskogo gosudarstva...*, p. 9.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom...*, Vol. 5, p. 348.

ment and his articles creatively develop the Marxist-Leninist theory on the historical destiny and the outlook for the future of the former colonial world.

Leonid Brezhnev's works objectively reflect a Marxist analysis of the contemporary stage of the national liberation struggle, both its historical triumphs—the victories of the peoples of Indochina and the former Portuguese colonies—and its difficulties and unresolved problems.

It is a fact that imperialism is retreating on all fronts. But while retreating it fights back. Imperialism is still capable of counter-attacking and even scoring local and temporary victories; it is adapting to the new conditions, changing its appearance, and tenaciously hangs on to its privileges, resorting to diverse means of economic coercion in the hope of retrieving what it had lost when it was forced to abandon direct political diktat and methods of colonial plunder. Under the new conditions Leonid Brezhnev focuses attention on neocolonialism as a system of economic, political, military and ideological means with which the imperialist powers intend to retain their positions in the developing countries. The struggle against neocolonialism is designated as the primary task of the national liberation movement and its ally, the socialist community. "Imperialism is actively working to slow down the advance towards independence and social progress, to keep its former colonies within the framework of the capitalist system, and to retain them as objects of exploitation, even if in modified form," says Leonid Brezhnev. "All this is a most grave threat to the future of the young independent countries. Their peoples are gradually coming to realise that neocolonialism is no lesser a danger than colonialism. This means that ahead lie the most acute battles between the fighters for real freedom and those who would like to fetter the young national states with the chains of a new bondage." *

At the same time the CPSU warns against underestimating the danger that imperialism might take recourse at any moment it may think suitable to methods of direct suppression, violence, aggression, intervention typical of the epoch of colonialism. "The imperialists are prepared to commit any crime in their efforts to preserve or restore their domination of the peoples

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 153.

in their former colonies or in other countries which are escaping from the grip of capitalist exploitation.”* The nature of imperialism has not changed. “In response to the gains of the national liberation movement imperialism intensifies its intrigues against the peoples of Asia and Africa and does its best to use the local reaction to further its own ends.”** Leonid Brezhnev rendered a withering description of the political methods employed by imperialism in his report to the 25th CPSU Congress: “The recent experience of the revolutionary movement provides graphic evidence that imperialism will stop at nothing, discarding all semblance of any kind of democracy, if a serious threat arises to the domination of monopoly capital and its political agents. It is prepared to trample upon the sovereignty of states and upon all legality, to say nothing of humanism. Slander, duping the public, economic blockade, sabotage, bringing about hunger and dislocation, bribes and threats, terrorism, assassination of political leaders, and fascist-style pogroms—such is the armoury of present-day counter-revolution, which always operates in conjunction with international imperialist reaction.”*** The imperialists’ atrocities in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the recent aggression against the People’s Republic of Angola, the support for the racialists in South Africa confirm these words and inspire the fighters for independence to be vigilant and ready to meet any change in imperialist policy whenever it may take place.

A distinguishing feature of the present-day situation in Africa and Asia is the diversity of paths adopted by the countries which had proclaimed political independence. In his speech at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties in Moscow on June 7, 1969, Leonid Brezhnev spoke of three groups of young states in Asia and Africa: those which were taking the path of socialist orientation, those where capitalist tendencies were predominant, and those in which a tense struggle for the path of development was in progress between the progressive forces and internal reaction with the result that their future path was still vaguely defined. There are also considerable differences within each of these groups. For example, in a number of countries where bourgeois forces or forces gravitating towards capitalism have

* 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 21.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom...*, Vol. 5, pp. 346-47.

*** Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU,

scored a temporary victory "power was seized, after the proclamation of political independence, by reactionary elements closely linked up with imperialism. Some of these countries are ruled by military dictatorships, and a reign of terror has been instituted against all progressive forces."* The analysis given by Leonid Brezhnev and the final document of the meeting clearly showed that the former colonies had two roads open to them: they could either break away from capitalism or follow in its wake. There may be vacillations between these two trends, intermediate stages and processes lacking a full qualitative definiteness. But in the long run this dilemma will confront all Afro-Asian countries. The first prospect opens the possibility of ensuring socio-economic progress and independence and surmounting social conflicts in favour of the people and raising their standard of living. The second prospect, development of capitalism in the Afro-Asian countries, cannot guarantee high growth rates, aggravates class contradictions, dooms the masses to renewed sufferings and may bring the country into neocolonialist dependence.

The CPSU is a principled champion and proponent of non-capitalist development or socialist orientation. The conviction with which it upholds and develops this revolutionary conclusion of creative Marxism and the enormous assistance which the CPSU and the Soviet state extends to the advanced socio-political forces prompt ever new Afro-Asian countries to become socialist-oriented.

"The socialist orientation of a number of young states of Africa and Asia is an important achievement of the revolutionary forces and a heavy defeat for imperialism," Leonid Brezhnev said. "These countries have scored their first successes in carrying through deep-going social and economic reforms, thereby providing fresh practical confirmation of the Leninist conclusion that in our epoch the peoples who win liberation from colonial oppression can advance along the path of social progress by-passing capitalism. One of the most important conditions which make such development possible is co-operation between the progressive young states and the socialist countries."**

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 152.

** *Ibid.*

Speaking at the 25th CPSU Congress about the complex processes of differentiation of the class forces and the growth of the class struggle in the liberated countries, Leonid Brezhnev drew attention to the fact that these processes do not follow the same pattern in the socialist-oriented countries where fresh progressive changes in economic and political life have taken place in recent years, and in countries developing along the capitalist road.

At the same time in the CC Report to the Congress he formulated a fundamentally important proposition concerning the main trends of the progressive changes which have been observed in many of the liberated countries in recent years. They were, he said, the "shifting of the centre of gravity in industrial development to the state sector, abolition of feudal landownership, nationalisation of foreign enterprises to assure the young states' effective sovereignty over their natural resources, and formation of their own personnel".*

These changes are taking place not only in the socialist-oriented countries, although they are most fully carried out precisely in these countries. The fact that this thesis was put forward at the Congress shows that although the CPSU regards the socialist-oriented states as the vanguard of the national liberation movement it does not think that they are the sole anti-imperialist potential of the former colonies and dependencies. The CPSU is prepared to support all progressive political forces. It is convinced that socialist orientation under contemporary conditions most fully expresses the aspirations of the labouring masses of Asia and Africa, and that it will be adopted by many other countries. But it does not intend to impose its views, nor to accelerate the course of events; it has every respect for the political course of each people and is ready to support its progressive measures along its chosen road. "The Soviet Union does not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples. It is an immutable principle of our Leninist foreign policy to respect the sacred right of every people, every country, to choose its own way of development. But we do not conceal our views. In the developing countries, as everywhere else, we are on the side of the forces of progress, democracy and national indepen-

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 15.

dence, and regard them as friends and comrades in struggle.” *

In an Address to the representatives of Communist organisations of the peoples of the East in 1919, Lenin said: “In this respect you are confronted with a task which has not previously confronted the Communists of the world: relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism.”** This task is just as topical today for the revolutionary movement in Asia and Africa. Leonid Brezhnev referred to it in his speech at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties: “Tremendous attention to the proletariat’s peasant ally, and additional elaboration of some aspects of strategy and tactics in application to the specific conditions in the former colonial countries is demanded of the communist movement.”***

How should the revolutionary movement develop, particularly a socialist-oriented one, in the agrarian and peasant countries, and what is its class basis? This is a fundamental theoretical and practical problem, and bourgeois propaganda puts in a great deal of effort to distort the Marxist approach to it. The anti-communist “interpreters” of Marxism keep on harping about the “unsuitability” of scientific socialism for the colonial, i.e. agrarian communities. Lenin’s Address to the Communists of the East cited above shows how far removed from the truth are these fabrications whose sole purpose is to scare people who are ignorant of Marxism away from this teaching.

“The central question of the revolutionary process in Asia and Africa today is that of the attitude of the peasantry, which make up a majority of the population,” said Leonid Brezhnev.****

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 16.

** V. I. Lenin, “Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

*** *International Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties, Moscow 1969*, pp. 153-54.

**** *Ibid.*, p. 153.

Seeing that the working class was small and at times historically unprepared to perform its mission of a political vanguard, the revolutionary democrats of the liberated countries came to regard the peasants as the most revolutionary class and counterposed it to the proletariat which in the colonies allegedly lacked the necessary qualities of a vanguard fighter intrinsic to the working class in the advanced countries. This idea, a product of revolutionary inconsistency and inadequacy of theoretical and practical experience, and also distrust of the working class, is often used by revisionists of various hues whose efforts to misinterpret Marxist-Leninist theory are resolutely repulsed by the CPSU. Leonid Brezhnev who in his speech at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties outlined the contours of the problem of the peasantry's role in the revolutionary movement in Africa and Asia, countered the unscientific conclusions which belittle the role of the working class, with a genuinely Marxist solution resting on the entire wealth of the theoretical thought and revolutionary practice of the international communist and revolutionary movement, including the one in Africa and Asia. It is not a question of choosing between the proletariat and the peasantry, but of taking into account the possibilities of each of these classes, their rapprochement and cohesion, and not contraposition.

"The peasants in that part of the world are a mighty revolutionary force," Brezhnev said, "but in most cases they are an elemental force, with all the ensuing vacillations and ideological and political contradictions. Nor could it have been otherwise for the time being, because the great majority of the peasantry still lives in conditions of monstrous poverty, denial of rights and surviving feudal and sometimes even pre-feudal relations.

"The experience of the revolutionary movement in various parts of the world has shown that the surest way of effectively involving the peasants in the struggle against imperialism, for true social progress, is to establish a strong alliance between them and the working class. That is also the task in the zone of national liberation."* Leonid Brezhnev noted the international aspect of the problem of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and spoke of the

* Ibid.

great importance of consolidating the revolutionary alliance between the national liberation movement and the young national states, on the one hand, and the countries of the socialist community and the Communist parties acting in the vanguard of the international working class, on the other.*

The formation of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry in Asian and African countries is the core of a more general problem, that of the cohesion of all anti-imperialist forces, of the establishment of a united national front. If a national liberation struggle fails to rally all the progressive forces of the nation to its banner, it will be doomed to defeat no matter who leads it — Communists, revolutionary democrats or national-bourgeois elements. In his works and daily activity Leonid Brezhnev with great firmness upholds Lenin's idea of a united anti-imperialist front formulated on the basis of the experience of the international working-class, communist and national liberation movement. In a message of greetings to the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos in connection with the proclamation of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos, Leonid Brezhnev observed that the "PRPL has exhibited an example of a flexible, creative approach to the tasks of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist struggle", and "had managed to unite the broadest masses on a national-democratic platform and acting in a united front with the fraternal peoples of Indochina and relying on the all-round support from the socialist countries and all progressive world forces ensured the triumph of the just cause of the Laotian people".**

* * *

In his speeches Leonid Brezhnev propounds a range of crucial tasks of the anti-imperialist movement stemming from a scientific analysis of its contemporary stage.

Priority is given to the complete liquidation of the survivals of colonialism and racialism throughout the world. Now that the colonial empire of fascist Portugal no longer exists

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 154.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom...*, Vol. 5, p. 408.

it is a question of the racist regimes in Southern Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa and of the self-determination of the people of Namibia. There is no longer any doubt that these last seats of outright colonial and racist dictatorship will soon make their exit. The last battle against the old colonialism is near at hand and both sides are mobilising forces. On the side of the peoples of southern Africa are the entire awakened continent, and the forces of socialism, peace and democracy throughout the world. On the side of the racists are international imperialism and reaction. A clash between them is inevitable and all political movements and states which bear responsibility for the development of events are aware of this.

The Programme of Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples advanced by the 25th CPSU Congress states in part: "Consider as crucial the international task of completely eliminating all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression, infringement of the equality and independence of peoples, and all seats of colonialism and racism." * The struggle against racism and apartheid is gaining increasing momentum. The armed resistance fighters are acting more and more boldly, ever greater masses of people are taking part in protest demonstrations and the assistance furnished by the liberated peoples and states of Africa, the countries of the socialist community and the world's democratic forces is becoming increasingly effective and multifarious. Under these conditions the racists and imperialists are inclined to make partial concessions and introduce reforms in the hope of averting the revolutionary destruction of regimes of racial exploitation and suppression and causing the consistently democratic and revolutionary liberation movement to fold up.

Leonid Brezhnev warned against such a "solution" of the problem of racism and apartheid and said that the progressive forces would not accept it. "It is true that now, when Africa has demonstrated its own ability to do away with the remnants of colonialism and racism," he said at a reception in honour of President of the People's Republic of Angola

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 32.

Antonio Agostinho Neto, "some people purporting to help this process have begun to make attempts to substitute a fictitious for the genuine liberation of southern Africa, and, in effect, to preserve the positions of imperialism in that region and bolster up the tottering bastion of racialism — the regime of the Republic of South Africa."* But the African peoples waged a heavy struggle for their dignity which lasted for decades not in order to replace the cynical dictatorship of the racialists by its outwardly decent neocolonialist form. In their efforts to bring their struggle to the end they have full sympathy and support from the world's first socialist state. "We are firmly convinced," Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, "that the problems of Zimbabwe and Namibia should be decided by the peoples of these countries themselves. The events of recent years in Africa show once again that only in this case can such problems be solved correctly, justly and really in the interests of the peoples themselves."**

As we have already said, direct forms of colonial plunder have been replaced by neocolonialist exploitation. The struggle against neocolonialism is turning into a decisive trend of the anti-imperialist movement. A national coat of arms and a flag can no longer satisfy the democratic forces. Now they have set themselves the task of winning true independence, and the main obstacle in their way is the involvement of the former colonies in the world capitalist system of economy, in the world capitalist market on the basis of an unequal, non-equivalent exchange. The young states have become convinced that it is impossible to fight single-handed for economically just conditions of trade. This gave birth to the idea of undertaking concerted action in order to alter the world system of economic exchange which has evoked massive response in the developing countries and has already been embodied in joint actions. The struggle for a new economic order is turning into the core of the problem of uprooting neocolonialist exploitation, and has the full support of the socialist community. Moreover, it took shape and is gaining momentum under the direct influence of the experience of economic cooperation of the socialist countries and their economic links with the young states.

* *Moscow News*, Supplement to Issue No. 42 (2718), 1976.

** Ibid.

"The CMEA member-states are active proponents of equitable, mutually beneficial economic co-operation of countries with different social systems," said Leonid Brezhnev. "The activity of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the principles on which it builds its work receive deserved recognition in the developing countries. As they uphold their legitimate rights to their national resources, cast off the diktat of the imperialist monopolies and consolidate their own economic independence, these countries display increasing interest in establishing effective co-operation with the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, with its participants whose internationalist policy they all know and highly appreciate."*

When the USSR and the international communist movement uphold the principles of equality in economic relations, they are in effect concerned not with introducing new forms of international cooperation, but with extending the norms which the states of the socialist community undeviatingly observe in relations between themselves and all other states, to the trade relations between the industrialised capitalist countries and the former colonies. Leonid Brezhnev expressed this thought at the Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe held in Berlin in June 1976. "The Conference's Document we have agreed upon," he said, "expresses Communists' readiness to help establish a new and just world economic order. The struggle for equal political and economic relations and cooperation between the developed countries and the former colonial and dependent countries—relations which have long been established between the latter and the socialist states—is an important part of our Parties' common international responsibility."**

The foreign policy of the CPSU, designed to strengthen peace and international security, to promote, deepen and consolidate detente and turn it into an irreversible process and a permanent factor of the international situation, has the approval of all people of good will. Leonid Brezhnev suggests that the Asian and African countries should take the same line on the grounds that detente can be lasting only if it assumes a global nature, and that any hotbed

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom...*, Vol. 5, p. 90.

** *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe*, Moscow, 1976, p. 26.

of military conflict or international tension threatens world peace and distracts the peoples from creative activity.

Leonid Brezhnev refutes the fabrication of the enemies of peace that detente does not benefit all people and that its development could be advantageous to some states at the expense of others, or at the expense of the national liberation movement. Addressing the international meeting "The Struggle for Peace and Security in Asia—Vital Task of Our Time" on September 25, 1974, he said: "The consolidation of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the successes in the struggle against attempts to create hotbeds of tension in the world and for the liquidation of the remaining colonial regimes give rise to new favourable opportunities for the triumph of the cause of peace and progress and are in line with fundamental interests of all countries, including those on the Asian continent." * His words about Asia are also relevant to all the liberated countries: "In short, Asia is a continent in development. But this process of development is bound to be extremely difficult, owing to the tenacity of the reactionary forces and the opposition encountered from imperialism and reaction. It is plain that stable peace, detente and good-neighbourly relations provide favourable conditions for the successful development of the process." **

Not only does detente promote economic and cultural development, it is also advantageous for the revolutionary struggle for national and social emancipation because it creates the most favourable conditions for solidarity and international assistance to the fighting peoples. Leonid Brezhnev said in the report "The 47th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" in 1964 that "conditions of peaceful coexistence are conducive to the success of the liberation struggle and the achievement of the revolutionary tasks of the peoples". *** Today no one doubts this. It was under the conditions of international detente that the world witnessed some of the greatest victories of the national libera-

* *Pravda*, June 30, 1976.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 251-52.

*** L. I. Brezhnev, *O vneshnei politike KPSS i Sovetskogo gosudarstva...*, p. 10.

tion movement including the rout of the puppet regime in South Vietnam and the unification of the country, the liberation of Laos and Kampuchea, the achievement of independence by the peoples of the former Portuguese colonies, the adoption by ever new countries of the non-capitalist path of development, the invigoration of the democratic movement and resolute concerted actions by the young states on the international scene. Detente, as the CPSU sees it, is by no means tantamount to reconciliation with the existing state of affairs and the slackening of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and reaction. On the contrary, it implies an intensification of this struggle and non-interference in the internal affairs of nations so that they can decide their own future. The fight against racism, colonialism, imperialism and internal reaction is not an obstacle to detente; it contributes to it, for only a just solution of international and internal conflicts creates a firm foundation for a lasting peace. "We are sure," said Leonid Brezhnev, "that peace and international security on earth will only benefit if all the nations of Africa, all the oppressed peoples without exception gain freedom and independence." *

The concept of the inviolable connection between detente and the invigoration of the anti-imperialist liberation movement was clearly expressed in the Programme of Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples which Leonid Brezhnev proclaimed at the 25th CPSU Congress. It designates the complete elimination of all the vestiges of colonial oppression, racialism, infringement of the equality and independence of peoples, abolition of discrimination of all kinds, of diktat and inequality in international economic relations and in trade as first priority tasks in the struggle for strengthening the peace on a global scale.

The fact that the CPSU is working for detente does not at all mean that it intends to go back on its internationalist duty of assisting the revolutionary movement in all forms which may prove necessary — political, economic, ideological and organisational, right up to direct aid to the oppressed peoples with weapons when the aggressive policy of imperialism compels the peoples to resort to this extreme measure.

* *Moscow News*, Supplement to Issue No. 42 (2718), 1976.

Such is the policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which always acts in keeping with the great principle of the working-class and communist movement—the principle of proletarian internationalism. Leonid Brezhnev made this clear when he said at the 25th CPSU Congress: “Our Party supports and will continue to support peoples fighting for their freedom. In so doing, the Soviet Union does not look for advantages, does not hunt for concessions, does not seek political domination, and is not after military bases. We act as we are bid by our revolutionary conscience, our communist convictions.”* The Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state reliably ensures the development of revolutionary processes in Afro-Asian countries. This is borne out by the experience of many countries, including the People’s Republic of Angola. “The events in Angola,” Leonid Brezhnev said, “reaffirmed a great truth of our days: the determination of a people to defend their freedom, multiplied by international solidarity, is an indomitable force.”**

Detente gives plenty of scope for the activity and initiative of all countries, both big and small. And the developing countries are called upon to make an outstanding contribution to this noble cause, particularly through the non-aligned movement. “The Soviet Union,” said Leonid Brezhnev, “welcomes the heightened role of the developing countries in world politics; it undeviatingly supports their struggle for equitable political and economic relations and for social progress. They are already doing much to improve the international climate. In this connection we appreciate the positive role played by the non-aligned movement. The principles underlying this movement—consolidation of peace and peaceful coexistence, independence of states, the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism—have passed the test of time.”***

The programme of struggle for the further development of detente sets concrete tasks before the Asian and African countries. Alongside the full liquidation of colonialism and racialism and the introduction of a new and more just economic order, they include the achievement of a just

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 16.

** *Moscow News*, Supplement to Issue No. 42 (2718), 1976.

*** *Pravda*, June 9, 1976.

and lasting settlement in the Middle East, and the establishment of security in Asia on the basis of joint efforts of the continent's states.

Being a socialist state, two-thirds of whose territory are in Asia, the Soviet Union is interested in the political situation in that part of the world and in extending the spirit of detente to it. "The Soviet Union," Leonid Brezhnev noted, "is firmly convinced that Asia can and must live according to the laws of peace, and collective security is a real way towards this." *

The principles of peaceful coexistence are consistent with the traditions and experience of the Asian states. "The idea of peace and security in Asia based on joint effort is far from new," said Leonid Brezhnev. "In the light of their own historical experience, Asian states have time and again suggested such principles and norms of relations which could serve as a basis for establishing peaceful, healthy relations among peoples.

The substance of the ten principles approved at the historic Bandung Conference in 1955 was to make Asia and Africa continents of peace and co-operation."** The Soviet Union is doing its best to turn Asia into a zone of peace, tranquillity and prosperity. Of course, this calls for good will on the part of all the Asian countries.

* * *

The revolutionary changes that have taken place in the Asian and African countries in the past decade are indeed grandiose. Never before has the anti-imperialist movement been so wide-flung and dynamic; never before have the positions of socialism in the former colonies been so firm and its prospects so promising; never before have the peoples who had thrown off colonial dependence played such an outstanding role in international affairs; never before has the cooperation between the developing countries and the socialist community of nations been so all-embracing, consistent and reliable.

It is hard to overestimate the contribution of the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and the international

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 252.

** Ibid., pp. 531-32.

working-class and communist movement to the progressive changes in the Afro-Asian world. The historic evolution of the peoples of the former colonies and dependencies is continuously experiencing the revolutionising influence of the socialist system and the international working-class and communist movement. Their struggle is in the centre of attention of the Soviet people and the CPSU.

The policy of the CPSU towards the national liberation movement in Asia and Africa has proved to be correct. It has yielded fruit, for it rests on a scientific analysis of the reality and adheres to the Leninist principle of the alliance between socialism and the peoples oppressed by imperialism. This alliance, whose contours were outlined by Lenin, has become a powerful factor of historical development, and an earnest of socialism, peace and progress.

India

Jawaharlal Nehru

Jawaharlal Nehru went down in history and is remembered by his contemporaries as India's greatest political figure, an outstanding leader of the national liberation movement, a consistent fighter for peace, democracy and social progress, a staunch opponent of social injustice, colonialism, racism and national oppression, a sincere friend of the Soviet Union.

During several decades his name was linked inseparably with the struggle for India's liberation from colonial slavery, for its resurrection and establishment as a great sovereign state of Asia. Since August 15, 1947, when Nehru raised the three-coloured national flag over the historic Red Fort in Delhi he stood for seventeen years at the helm of independent India, leading her along the path of eradication of colonialism, the vestiges of feudalism and ages-old backwardness, towards national revival and rejuvenation.

Under Nehru's leadership India's government system was reorganised by setting up states according to the national-ethnic and language characteristics, which put an end to the British administrative system based on the "divide and rule" principle and the feudal fragmentation of the country; the initial agrarian reforms were carried out, undermining the traditional system of large landed estates, which had served for two centuries as the foundation of British colonial domination. He directed the restructuring of the national economy on the planning principle, laid the basis for India's industrialisation policy—the key prerequisite for her economic

growth. On Nehru's initiative and with Soviet assistance a large state sector was established in the economy, which is steadily growing stronger today. He was a consistent democrat, a fighter for equality, against the survivals of caste discrimination and religious-communal reaction, for India's strong national unity based on a combination of the principles of centralism and democracy.

Nehru's activities were not confined to the sphere of politics. He had sophisticated intelligence, an encyclopedic erudition, a profound philosophical frame of mind. In his immense literary heritage a universal education and broad interests, the originality and sharpness of wit combine with the sensitive approach, full of inner warmth, temperament and dramatism, of a man seeking and fighting, at times doubting and erring, but never abandoning his faith in progress. Nehru was a philosopher and a poet. One is apt to think that even if he had not been an outstanding political leader, his historico-philosophic writings alone would have entitled him to the attention and interest of posterity. Nehru's literary work, however, cannot be separated from his political biography. "The more action and thought are allied and integrated, the more effective they become and the happier you grow.... The happiest man is he whose thinking and action are co-ordinated," he said.*

He thought in concrete terms, with an eye to the tasks of the day but simultaneously he sought to gain an insight into the future. In his thinking he combined magnificently the day-to-day life of his long-suffering people, their great past and radiant future. For Nehru historical and philosophical meditation was not an end in itself but a search for an answer to the most important problems of concern to his homeland and all mankind. Nehru looked into the past in order to comprehend the present and to foresee the future.

It is from these positions that he wrote the first two books which came out in Russian—*The Discovery of India* and *An Autobiography*.

These books helped greatly to inform Soviet people of the history and contemporary problems of India. The book *Glimpses of World History* brought out recently in Russian is written in the same vein. The author's outlook is wider here. In his letters to his daughter from a British jail Nehru

* *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches*, Vol. III, Delhi, 1958, p. 472.

presents a picture of the development of human society on a worldwide scale, dwelling upon the major events of world history, singling out and summing up the main aspects of the historical process. The history of India is described along with and in comparison with developments in other countries and parts of the world. This is a profound and original work of an historian, though not an academic research. Just as in *The Discovery of India*, Nehru attempts to comprehend the past of his country, in the given case, through the prism of world history so as to see its present more clearly and outline the ways of changing it. The past engages Nehru's interest primarily as a "pointer to the future". For him history is a school of life, experience, and struggle, the source of the origin of the world outlook. Nehru approaches it as an active political leader stimulated to research by the requirements of struggle and practice in general. "My fascination for history was not in reading about odd events that happened in the past but rather in its relation to the things that led up to the present. Only then did it become alive to me. Otherwise it would have been an odd thing unconnected with my life or the world," he said.*

Of particular interest is the world outlook of a man who was one of the acknowledged leaders of the national liberation movement, headed the independent Indian state and influenced its present and future over the last quarter-century more than anybody else.

Nehru approaches the history of mankind and of his country primarily as a rationalist thinker. He seeks within it an inner meaning, a logic of development and does not approach it with a priori, extra-historical categories. Such is also Nehru's attitude to the past of his homeland. It lacks—and in this respect Nehru differs favourably from many others—an uncritical admiration for antiquity, an idea, wrong by virtue of its narrow-mindedness, of the exclusiveness and separateness of India's historical path. Also noteworthy is the fact that Nehru's views are quite unaffected by religious or reactionary ethic mysticism fairly common in India. The traditions of not only European but also world rationalism, European and world intellectual culture critically interpreted by Nehru, who had gone through the school of classical European upbringing, influenced his historical concepts, especially in

* *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, 1949-1953*, Calcutta, 1954, p. 378.

relation to India, helped him to rid himself of bias, lopsidedness, idealisation, and to see his homeland just as it was in comparison with other countries—great and impotent, rich and poor, happy and unfortunate, free and suffering under the jackboot of the occupationists.

“It was in my blood and there was much in her that instinctively thrilled me. And yet I approached her almost as an alien critic, full of dislike for the present as well as for many of the relics of the past that I saw. To some extent I came to her via the West and looked at her as a friendly Westerner might have done,” he wrote.*

Having rejected abstract and fruitless quests of the meaning of history outside it as such, Nehru gradually discovered and later recognised the internal laws of historical development, and thereby made a fundamental step to a realistic, almost materialist—but not yet dialectical—interpretation of the historical process.

“In Asia, many historical forces have been at work for many years past and many things have happened which are good and many things which are not so good, as always happens when impersonal historical forces are in action. They are still in action. We try to mould them a little, to divert them here and there, but essentially they will carry on till they fulfil their purpose and their historical destiny.”** His recognition of the objective laws led Nehru to a comprehension of the upward spiralwise direction of the historical process—not without occasional regression—an understanding of it as an objective and progressive course of events, as an ascent, in the final analysis, from the lower to the higher.

These elements of Nehru’s world outlook positively influenced his political activities as well. He tried to approach them neither voluntaristically nor moralistically, nor from the viewpoint of religious requirements, but scientifically, attempting boldly to introduce them into the general, objectively necessary course of history, to bring them into line with progressive tendencies. It was precisely in conformity with the demands of the stormy period when he lived and worked, predetermined by all of mankind’s preceding development, that Nehru regarded the line of mass political struggle

* J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, New York, 1946, p. 38.

** J. Nehru, *India’s Foreign Policy*, Delhi, 1961, p. 256.

as justified and realistic. This is precisely how he approached the planning of his country's policy. He abided consistently by the progressive scientific conception that the people was the genuine creator of history, while the activities of the political leaders should be subordinated to the struggle for meeting the aspirations and requirements of the masses. Here there is still no clear realisation of the historical role of the struggle between classes, but Nehru emphasised in this context that "the people were the principal actors, and behind them, pushing them on, were great historical urges.... But for that historical setting and political and social urges, no leaders or agitators could have inspired them to action."*

The influence of scientific socialism manifested itself perhaps most strikingly in Nehru's views on the historical process as being guided by objective laws and on the role of the masses. Nehru's world outlook formed under the influence of many schools, both Indian and European, which may prompt one to regard Nehru as not original, as an eclectic, and put a stop at that. This, however, would be quite unpardonable primitivism. Nehru is much more complex, and an oversimplified approach to the study of his views is impermissible. Nehru was characterised by a striving to comprehend and assimilate much of what had been accumulated in mankind's experience and to select what was best in it. Nehru sometimes used in the political struggle individual principles of various philosophical systems and this, of course, at times hid from his sight their incompatibility, irreconcilability, antagonism, and inevitably led to eclecticism, though he tried to avoid it in every way. He preferred "a mental or spiritual attitude which synthesizes differences and contradictions, tries to understand and accommodate different religions, ideologies, political, social and economic systems".**

Nobody had ever succeeded in producing a "synthesis of ideologies". Nehru knew this. Contradictory elements, divorced from their class soil outwardly, as it were, did not and could not find a unity and reconciliation in his own world outlook. Nobody can harmonise what is incompatible, antagonistic, contradictory in class character. As an honest scholar Nehru not infrequently revised critically his initial conceptual constructions devoid of a strictly defined class basis, seeking to go

* J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, London, 1953, p. 282.

** R. K. Karanjia, *The Mind of Mr. Nehru*, London, 1960, p. 89.

ahead and develop his views. In this sense the direction of Nehru's political and social quests, the tendencies of their development were fruitful and retain their significance in India to this day. It is important, however, that in his quest for an answer to the most vital problems of the anti-imperialist struggle which he led and of the future of the former colonial countries Nehru sought to keep step with the times, with the 20th century, in which the road to socialism is the only one worth following.

He absorbed the traditions of ancient Indian culture and the rich history of its national liberation movement, in particular the philosophy and practices of Gandhism. He assimilated everything that West European democracy and bourgeois liberalism could offer. While receiving an education in its cradle—Great Britain—and experiencing disillusionment, Nehru turned to socialist ideas, initially in their Fabian interpretation. But once he turned to the ideals of equality and social justice, Nehru came close to the perception of many principles of scientific socialism thanks to the power of his critical, searching mind. Nehru did not resist this process. On the contrary, he avidly studied the theory and practice of scientific socialism in the belief that very much of it was acceptable to India. Nehru was one of the first leaders of the national liberation movement who were not afraid to speak of the epoch-making worldwide significance of Marxism-Leninism to the national-revolutionaries and the national-reformists. This is not surprising since Nehru himself saw in this science the ineluctable logic of historical development, the imperative demand of the time—the epoch of transition to socialism. Nehru repeatedly emphasised the favourable impact of scientific socialism on his world outlook. He wrote in this connection: "...The theory and philosophy of Marxism lightened up many a dark corner of my mind. History came to have a new meaning for me. The Marxist interpretation threw a flood of light on it, and it became an unfolding drama with some order and purpose, however unconscious, behind it. In spite of the appalling waste and misery of the past and the present, the future was bright with hope, though many dangers intervened. It was the essential freedom from dogma and the scientific outlook of Marxism that appealed to me." * This was a bold and original

* J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, pp. 362-63.

statement, especially for India which still abided by its ancient and medieval traditions, for its peasantry, the petty strata of the urban population and a considerable proportion of the intelligentsia of Hinduist sentiments.

In another place Nehru pointed out: "A study of Marx and Lenin produced a powerful effect on my mind and helped me to see history and current affairs in a new light. The long chain of history and of social development appeared to have some meaning, some sequence, and the future lost some of its obscurity."*

Scientific socialism attracted Nehru not only as a theory. Its influence was particularly strong because Nehru admired the gigantic and unprecedented experiment in revolutionary remaking of the old world being carried out at that time in Soviet Russia.

"While the rest of the world was in the grip of the depression and going backward in some ways, in the Soviet country a great new world was being built up before our eyes.

"Russia, following the great Lenin, looked into the future and thought only of what was to be, while other countries lay numbed under the dead hand of the past and spent their energy in preserving the useless relics of a bygone age. In particular, I was impressed by the reports of the great progress made by the backward regions of Central Asia under the Soviet regime. In the balance, therefore, I was all in favour of Russia, and the presence and example of the Soviets was a bright and heartening phenomenon in a dark and dismal world."**

Only a very honest and sincere man and political leader unburdened by the traditions of feudal or bourgeois India, a man who had a critical view of capitalism and witnessed the birth of the new, Soviet socialist world could have said such prophetic words, which have retained their significance to date.

Nehru followed with keen interest the progress of social transformations in Soviet Russia. He made his first visit to our country with his father, Motilal Nehru, a prominent leader of the Indian National Congress party, as far back as 1927 in the days of the tenth anniversary of Soviet power. What he saw here led him to conclude: "...The Soviet revolu-

* J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 17.

** J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, pp. 361-62.

tion had advanced human society by a great leap and had lit a bright flame which could not be smothered, and ... it had laid the foundations for that 'new civilization' toward which the world would advance." *

Was it not, indeed, a brilliant assessment of the genuine revolutionary process and a brilliant forecast for decades ahead?

Nehru had a profound interest in Lenin, his personality, theoretical and practical activities. Evaluating Lenin's role in history, Nehru wrote that "...millions have considered him as a saviour and the greatest man of the age".** Nehru described Lenin as "...a mastermind and a genius in revolution".***

Nehru's ideal was the unity of thought and action, theory and practice. The influence of the ideas of scientific socialism, his high assessment of the historic contributions of the USSR logically led him to recognise the need to carry out radical socio-economic reforms in India, to proclaim socialism at first as a relatively remote ideal of the social system and later as the ultimate goal of the political struggle.

In his speech at a session of the Indian National Congress party in Lucknow in 1936 Nehru said: "I am convinced that the only key to the solution of the world's problems and of India's problems lies in Socialism, and when I use this word I do so not in a vague humanitarian way but in the scientific, economic sense.... I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation, and the subjection of the Indian people except through Socialism. That involves vast and revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of vested interests in land and industry.... That means the ending of private property, except in a restricted sense, and the replacement of the present profit system by a higher ideal of co-operative service.... In short, it means a new civilization, radically different from the present capitalist order." ****

This statement was like a bolt from the blue. It was the first statement made by a national-revolutionary who proclaimed with such determination and consistency the inevi-

* J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 17.

** Ibid., p. 289.

*** J. Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, New York, 1942, p. 638.

**** J. Nehru, *India's Freedom*, London, 1962, p. 35.

tability of India's transition to socialism. It was addressed to the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois audience of the Indian National Congress party in the conditions of the British colonialist reign of terror. It should be underscored that Nehru's description of socialism as a social system based on the abolition of private property and the domination of public property as the sole means of delivering the people from the abominable ages-old poverty was correct in principle. The reader will easily note, however, that while the goal itself, its presentation and definition are correct, the means of achieving it are either not outlined at all or have a reformist character.

Nehru perceived in the socialist remaking of society the logical result of mankind's historical development. He stressed that capitalism "is not longer suited to the present age", that the world had outgrown it. He pointed out that the scientific and technological revolution makes the need for socialism particularly obvious, and that the modern scientific approach is exactly the socialist approach.*

At the same time, Nehru was one of the first leaders of the anti-colonialist movement to indicate with striking clarity, forcefulness and farsightedness that the movement towards socialism was a specific requirement for the developing countries, an objectively predetermined path of progress for states which had thrown off the colonial yoke, for India in particular. In this thesis and its argumentation Nehru had anticipated many propositions put forward later by a number of Asian and African political leaders. Nehru posed clearly the question of the unacceptability of capitalism for the liberated countries in view of the fact that the latter had no time at their disposal to achieve progress by the same methods, at the same rates and in the same cruel forms of exploitation of man by man as the Western world had done at one time. Should we follow the British, French or American way? he asked. Do we really have as much time as 100 to 150 years to achieve our goal? This is absolutely unacceptable. In such an event we shall simply perish.**

In his statements on the socio-economic programme of the ruling Indian National Congress party after winning independence Nehru laid emphasis on the need for industrialisation and the enforcement of the planning principle to ensure independent national development. He said in this context:

* See J. Nehru, *India Today and Tomorrow*, New Delhi, 1959, p. 28.

** See J. Nehru, *Towards a Socialist Order*, New Delhi, 1956, p. 4.

"Broadly our objective is to establish a Welfare State with a Socialist pattern of society, with no great disparities of income and offering an equal opportunity to all."*

One cannot but notice a measure of uncertainty and vagueness in this pronouncement though it reflects Nehru's passionate desire for India to advance along the path of social progress. What is, indeed, a "Welfare State"? Where is it and the interests of which class or a coalition of which classes does it represent? What is "a Socialist pattern of society" and "an equal opportunity to all"? Admittedly there are many types of socialist society, although it is perfectly obvious that socialism is unique in its foundation rather than composed of different types and that "an equal opportunity" which is, incidentally, promulgated in the Constitution of India may mask and indeed masks the most flagrant and, unfortunately, growing social, class, property, caste and any other inequality of the formally equal citizens of the Republic of India.

Thus Nehru admitted the objective need for remaking the Indian society along socialist lines, although his interpretation of the very process, means, forms and methods of this remaking contained his specific, mostly subjective-idealistic and—it may be said—reformist concepts. They were attributable to the exceptionally intricate tangle of class antagonisms characteristic of modern India, its multistructural social system and, most important of all, to Nehru's underestimation of the special historical role of the working class as the vehicle of the ideology of scientific communism, as the leader of all working people and, consequently, the majority of the nation. The alignment of class forces in the national liberation movement against the British colonial rule and later in independent India limited Nehru's possibilities to translate his subjective ideals into reality. India was following the capitalist path, the contradictions inherent in capitalism were steadily growing, and the ideals of a "Welfare State" and a "Socialist pattern of society" remained somewhere in a thick fog. The bourgeoisie was growing fantastically rich, and a monopolistic elite was taking shape: 75 concerns were in control of the private industrial sector. Equal opportunities did exist, but the actual inequality increased at a fast rate.

The tremendous scale of the tasks facing the general democratic movement in India and providing the basis for broad

* *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches. 1957-1963*, Vol. IV, Delhi, 1964, p. 151.

unity of national forces inevitably influenced Nehru's views and especially his policy. At times Nehru elevated to an absolute, as it were, the transient alignment of classes, which was conditioned by a definite level of the democratic movement and conformed to the objectives of its definite stage; this alignment of class forces, however, could not be preserved as soon as the question of socialist remaking was raised. The classes and class antagonisms made themselves felt with increasing urgency. Participants in the mass movements persistently demanded not so much "equal opportunities" as decent conditions of life for the working people and its improvement. Nehru, however, seemed, as it were, unwilling to go beyond the framework of the general democratic stage of the revolution in his analysis of the Indian society, to admit that the struggle for socialism required a radically different class orientation, that in a transition from the general democratic tasks to the socialist tasks the content, composition and correlation of the components of the united national front in the period of the anti-imperialist movement should, in the final analysis, change essentially, and new classes and new leading forces should come on the scene of the struggle.

Not that Nehru failed to admit the existence of classes and the class struggle in the country but he advanced the thesis on the possibility to resolve the class antagonisms by compromise and reforms based on class collaboration as the key guideline for national policy. He advocated a harmonious development of society on the basis of collaboration between classes. He believed that the growth of the influence of the propertied and exploiter classes in the country's economic and political life could be prevented by persuasion alone.

One cannot but note in this a definite influence of the liberal, bourgeois-democratic and simply reformist views, as well as Mahatma Gandhi's Utopian moralistic conceptions.

It is precisely these views and conceptions that were the starting point of the subjective criticism by Nehru and his followers of individual aspects in Soviet history, of certain principles of the theory of scientific socialism, of the communist movement in India. This reflected the profound contradiction in Nehru's world outlook, which he had never overcome, although he made some efforts to this end. The long-lasting and fairly deep isolation of India, its social thought and even Nehru himself from the achievements of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practices of the socialist construction in the

USSR and other countries also limited his possibilities for a full understanding of the processes of the formation of the new socialist world and especially the overcoming of the incredible difficulties facing the trail-blazers towards socialism, a society which he justly regarded as India's only saviour from the scourge of capitalism. Nehru was coming to accept really existing socialism gradually, with great subjectivism and reservations, particularly as regards the conception of class struggle and the historical role of the working class.

On the one hand, Nehru admits the scientific truth of the Marxist interpretation of history based on revealing the class antagonisms. "Marx constantly talks of exploitation and class struggle..." Nehru wrote. "But, according to Marx, this is not a matter for anger or good virtuous advice. The exploitation is not the fault of the person exploiting. The dominance of one class over another has been the natural result of historical progress.... Marx did not preach class conflict. He showed that in fact it existed, and had always existed in some form or other." * Criticising in his *An Autobiography* Gandhi's preaching of the principle of non-violence, Nehru writes: "If there is one thing that history shows it is this: that economic interests shape the political views of groups and classes. Neither reason nor moral considerations override these interests. Individuals may be converted, they may surrender their special privileges, although this is rare enough, but classes and groups do not do so. The attempt to convert a governing and privileged class into forsaking power and giving up its unjust privileges has therefore always so far failed, and there seems to be no reason whatever to hold that it will succeed in the future." **

It would seem nothing could be clearer. On the other hand, in the 1950s and 1960s Nehru nevertheless sought to reconcile his recognition of class struggle with Gandhi's conception of class harmony, contradicting his own perfectly realistic assessments of earlier years. "So while not denying or repudiating class contradictions, we want to deal with the problem in a peaceful and co-operative way by lessening rather than increasing these conflicts and trying to win over people instead of threatening to fight them or destroy them..." he said. "...The concept of class struggles or wars has been out-dated

* J. Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, pp. 546-47.

** J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, p. 544.

as too dangerous at a time....”* The inconsistency of these conclusions despite his clear understanding of the conception of class struggle is quite obvious.

Leaving aside the confusion and identifying of class struggle with war, the absolute contraposition of non-violence to violence, the peaceful and violent ways of resolving class contradictions, one would like to think that these words expressed not so much the evolution of Nehru's convictions at the end of his life as a pragmatic requirement issuing from the political line largely shaped by the right-wing forces in the leadership of the extremely heterogeneous, multiclass national-reformist ruling party—the Indian National Congress. These right-wing forces persistently strengthened their influence in that period, which led later to a division of the Congress and the emergence from its midst of the wing which continued Nehru's domestic and foreign policies.

The experience of political struggle and the country's socio-economic development inexorably contradicted Nehru's views. It failed to confirm the conception of class collaboration, the possibility of “re-education” of the Indian landlords and capitalists but, on the contrary, it abounded in sharp social conflicts, in the course of which the privileged classes protected their interests by resorting to any means of suppressing the protest of the working people and an overt coercion against them. Once it felt strong enough, the monopoly elite of the bourgeoisie not only sought to trample under foot the numerous and many-faced middle and petty bourgeoisie but also frenziedly strained to seize power, without stopping at the demand to dislodge the Indian National Congress party and the Nehru leadership along with it.

The heat of the class struggle, his sincere compassion for the oppressed and desire to improve their lot, his invariable dedication to the socialist ideals again compelled Nehru to make a sober assessment of the profundity and objective character of the class antagonisms in the Indian society.

Nehru could not, in the final analysis, fail to admit the existence in India of “privileged groups and classes” resisting radical reforms. He pointed out the fact that to protect their selfish interests these social strata (to which he ascribed not only the semifeudal landowners but primarily the monopoly elite of the national bourgeoisie) leant towards an accord

* R. K. Karanjia, *The Mind of Mr. Nehru*, pp. 76-77.

with imperialism and neocolonialism and might go against the interests of the country's national and social progress. The proclamation by the Indian National Congress party of socialist slogans did not lead Nehru to superficial idealisation of the Indian society. He realised that it is a far cry from a slogan to reality. Remaining a realist in its assessment he said that it was a capitalist economy with a considerable measure of government control, or a capitalist economy plus a public sector directly controlled by the state.*

As a farsighted politician Nehru was aware of the threat to the policy he was planning and pursuing to build in India a society after a "Socialist pattern", a threat to progress and democracy not only from the Indian society's traditional forces of feudal or religious-communal reaction but also from the growing capitalist monopolies. Shortly before his death, in the autumn of 1963, he wrote: "Monopoly is the enemy of socialism. To the extent it has grown during the last few years we have drifted away from the goal of socialism."** This was a bitter but true admission.

The years which have passed since Nehru's death have fully borne out his misgivings concerning the reactionary role of Indian monopoly capital, the feudal and semifeudal landlords and numerous political groups and parties, both in the centre and in the states, the right and the left extremist, which often joined forces in the struggle against Nehru and the Indian National Congress party. India's left, democratic forces, all supporters of the Nehru line waged and are waging now a determined fight against the anti-popular ambitions of monopoly capital and its allies.

Nehru's views on foreign policy were consistently progressive, and in this field there was no conflict which distinguished his concepts of socialism and his domestic policy. As a thinker and statesman Nehru made an outstanding contribution to the cause of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism, to safeguarding international peace, to the postwar change in the alignment of forces on the world scene in favour of the forces of national liberation, progress and socialism.

Nehru was a consistent fighter for peace and international security. He upheld peaceful coexistence and was an active champion of detente, of curbing the arms race and effecting

* See A. I. C. C., *Economic Review*, Delhi, September 15, 1957, pp. 6-7.

** *Congress Bulletin*, No. 9-11, 1963, p. 55.

general disarmament. He was one of the founding fathers of the policy of non-alignment which made the basis of India's peaceful foreign policy. As he saw it, non-alignment by no means implied passive neutrality.

Nehru organically combined positive neutrality with a consistent struggle against colonialism, and invariably emphasised the importance of this struggle. It will be recalled that he contributed effectively to the disintegration of the Portuguese colonial empire. In 1961 he ordered Indian troops to enter the Portuguese colonial enclaves in India (Goa, Daman, Diu) and expelled the last colonialists from the country.

Nehru's warning concerning economic dependence on imperialism is fully valid for India and other developing countries.

Nehru was one of the co-authors of the principles of peaceful coexistence — *panch sila* — which have been broadly recognised as the basis for mutual relations between Asian countries. He was one of the co-sponsors of the historic Bandung Conference, which was a milestone event in the process of uniting the newly-independent states of Asia and Africa in the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism, for peace, freedom and socio-economic progress.

Another historic contribution made by Nehru was his unwavering efforts towards unity and alliance with all progressive forces in the world arena. As far back as 1927 he took an active part in the Anti-Imperialist Congress of Oppressed Nations in Brussels. "Ideas of some common action between oppressed nations inter se, as well as between them and the Labour left wing, were very much in the air," he wrote. "It was felt more and more that the struggle for freedom was a common one against the thing that was imperialism, and joint deliberation and, where possible, joint action were desirable." * This was an important step towards a recognition of the need for unity between the national liberation and the revolutionary movements, including the working-class movement throughout the world. Revolutionary anti-imperialism as represented by Nehru responded to the appeal for broad cooperation and unity of action from the leader of the proletarian revolution—Lenin. India takes up positions along-

* J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, p. 161.

side the world's progressive forces fighting against fascism and imperialism, Nehru declared.*

Nehru's constant desire for a mutual understanding with the Soviet Union was one of the most striking and fruitful manifestations of this line. The establishment and successful development of Indian-Soviet cooperation were inseparably linked with the personality of Nehru and his political line. The friendly relations between our countries, the basis for which was laid by his policy, have long become, to quote Leonid Brezhnev, "a most convincing manifestation of the great alliance between the world of socialism and the world born of the national liberation movement".** These relations are a model of peaceful coexistence and fruitful cooperation between states with different socio-economic systems, united by their common interests in the struggle for peace and international security.

The favourable development of Soviet-Indian relations throughout the period since India's independence found a profound expression in the Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation signed in August 1971. The official friendly visit of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev, to India in November 1973 perpetuated all the positive achievements in the relations between the two countries over the preceding years, and was another important contribution to the development of their friendly bilateral relations, as well as to promoting detente and security in Asia and throughout the world. The joint Soviet-Indian Declaration signed at the end of the visit and other documents developing the basic principles of relations between the USSR and India and setting the guidelines for cooperation between them were warmly approved in both countries and highly appreciated by the democratic public of the world.

The main achievements of the Indian people, of the country's democratic forces in the economic and foreign policy fields are justifiably associated with the name of Nehru and the implementation of the Nehru line.

The Nehru line both in his lifetime and especially after his death was and continues to be the target of fierce attacks from

* See J. Nehru, *Presidential Address. Indian National Congress, 49th Session, April 1936, Lucknow-Allahabad, 1936, p. 5.*

** *Pravda*, November 28, 1973.

the reactionary forces seeking to prevent India's socio-economic renovation, to revise its positive foreign policy of peace, to undermine Soviet-Indian friendship. The right-wing forces often attempt to distort the genuine essence of Nehru's socio-philosophic and political views, to manipulate his name in pursuance of their selfish goals alien to the interests of the Indian people. These attempts, however, are doomed to failure.

Nehru's humanistic, democratic and socialist ideals have not been buried in oblivion after his death. A sharp controversy has flared up over them. The right-wing forces would like to turn them into a screen for pursuing a policy suited for the wealthy elite. In the meantime, the followers of the Nehru line are working to promote the country's economic and social progress, to translate into life the finest ideals of this outstanding leader of the Indian people. The progressive forces inside and outside the Indian National Congress party are seeking to repulse the right-wing forces both inside and outside the Congress, making for this purpose alliances for a joint struggle against reaction.

The Indian Revolutionary Emigration in Soviet Russia

The left national-revolutionary elements hold a conspicuous place in the history of the social movement in British India, particularly in the period after the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. They began to form as far back as the early 20th century (Tilak et al.), but acquired a more distinct ideological and political colouring and to a certain extent a capacity to set up independent political organisations in the 1920s. For this they had had to go through the school of political emigration and prior to that the majority of them had waged a long terrorist struggle against the British colonialist apparatus and, lastly, the cream of them had gradually assimilated Marxist ideology. All this was an arduous test, and not all of them withstood it. Many revolutionary figures of that time left the ranks of the left wing of the Indian National Congress party. Both groups later produced outstanding organisers — the founders of the Indian working-class and communist movement.

Let us turn to the Indian revolutionary emigration in Russia which emerged after the victory of the October Revolution.*

The emigration flow to the Soviet Union of Indian anti-

* The Indian revolutionary emigration in Russia is the subject of the well-documented work *Revolutsionery Indii v Strane Sovietov* (Revolutionaries of India in the Land of Soviets) by M. A. Persits, Moscow, 1973.

imperialist revolutionaries, fighters for the freedom and independence of their homeland—a story full of drama, revolutionary romanticism, sincerity and enthusiasm—was made possible by the profound, multiform and extremely fruitful impact of the October Revolution on the colonial and dependent peoples oppressed by imperialism, which were rising against their foreign masters. This flow could not be stopped either by the Himalayas or the Hindu Kush mountains or by the all-seeing and all-knowing Intelligence Service, or by the cruel British colonial administration.

Tsarist Russia had received in its Central Asian possessions only Indian merchants and moneybags. The few Indian national-revolutionaries who found themselves here before the October Revolution by no means enjoyed the sympathies of the official authorities. After the Revolution the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic became a shelter for Indian revolutionaries seeking support in their struggle for national independence.

Among the Indian national-revolutionaries who came to the Soviet Union there were both politically organised and politically unorganised emigrants, in particular, members of the so-called Provisional Government of India formed as far back as 1915 in Kabul by Raja Mahendra Pratap, and of a group which had broken away from this “government” and formed as the Indian section of the Council for International Propaganda in Tashkent in April 1920. These politically organised groups advanced fairly similar revolutionary-democratic programmes envisaging complete national independence for India and the establishment of the Indian Federative Republic. They exhibited certain socialist tendencies based on egalitarian and other pre-Marxist and generally rather Utopian concepts of the essence of the socialist system. All of them welcomed the October Revolution, whose import they saw, above all, in the implementation of the right of nations to self-determination up to secession. These limited conceptions are quite understandable. The Indian national-revolutionaries had not yet adopted a socialist programme of their own. It is significant, however, that all of them firmly upheld the idea of a strong alliance of the Indian national liberation movement with Soviet Russia. They regarded it with full justification as a herald of freedom and national liberation, a high-principled opponent of British colonialism, a defender of the enslaved Indian people.

Some Indian national-revolutionaries demonstrated their full solidarity with Soviet Russia by defending its socialist revolution against the whiteguards and local *basmachis* gangs by force of arms.

Some leaders and groups, in addition to unquestionably progressive, anti-imperialist views, preserved, sometimes even to a great extent, such elements of their former, pre-October concepts as fear of a mass popular revolution in India, predilection for conspiracy, terrorism, exclusive reliance on violent means of liberating India, up to military intervention by revolutionary Russia to end the British colonial rule.

The Indian section of the Council for International Propaganda in Tashkent underwent perhaps the most successful evolution towards the socialist ideals and came closer than others to the realisation that India's freedom and independence could only be won by an active mass struggle of the Indian people themselves. This realisation was a great achievement of the aforesaid group of revolutionaries, all the more so as it was taking place against the background of the growing mass movement in India itself, which was developing in the Gandhist, non-violent forms of nationwide civil disobedience.

As it follows from an analysis of factual material, the majority of the Indians arriving in Soviet Russia sought to receive primarily military aid to launch a war of liberation in India. They believed that the British rule in India could be overthrown exclusively by force of arms, for which the mass arming of the Indian people and direct military assistance of the Red Army from Russia were necessary. It was not easy to make these national-revolutionaries understand the realities, and it was probably not fortuitous that most of them failed to adopt Marxist ideology.

Some revolutionary emigrants, however, sincerely desired to learn the revolutionary experience of Soviet Russia and Marxism and use it to find a solution to the political and social problems of liberation of their homeland from the British rule. Since the early 1920s such Indian revolutionaries came to Soviet Russia in growing numbers, which evidenced the gradual assimilation of revolutionary Marxist theory by the front-ranking fighters for India's independence. Many of this group of revolutionaries later became the initiators and organisers of the national liberation, working-class, peasant and communist movements in India.

The first communist group arose within the Indian revolutionary emigration in the early 1920s and proclaimed themselves the Communist Party of India, although they never became nor could they become one. The fact is that the formation of the ranks of the Indian Communist Party was a complicated and long-lasting process. In India the small peasantry enslaved by feudals and money-lenders prevailed, the proletariat was relatively small numerically, while the bourgeoisie was more experienced politically than the other classes of the Indian society, the caste and religious traditions predominated and the unbridled British military and political oppression reigned supreme. All this caused a powerful upsurge of the national liberation movement which embraced almost all the classes of the Indian society and advanced the national rather than social problems to the foreground.

The difficulties of the formation of an independent communist movement in India and suchlike countries were quite considerable. It is known that Lenin called in question the very possibility of the formation there in that distant period of the early 1920s of Communist parties made up of proletarian elements and adopting the ideology of Marxism. The fact that the first Indian communist group formed in Soviet Russia within the Indian revolutionary emigration and that the process of the formation of the Communist Party took many years, reflected the difficulties attending the emergence of the communist movement in India.

The social tendencies which became manifest in the Indian people's national liberation struggle and were connected historically with the first independent working-class actions in India's larger centres of capitalist industry (Bombay, Calcutta, Ahmedabad, Kanpur, Madras, Sholapur, etc.) impelled many Indian national-revolutionaries to move closer to scientific socialism, to study the revolutionary practices of the Bolshevik Party in Russia. It was in Marxist theory and in its practical application by Russia's Bolsheviks led by Lenin that the Indian national-revolutionaries sought an answer to the question of how to win national independence for their homeland and go over to the solution of urgent social problems.

* * *

The forms of transition of peoples to socialism are varied. Also varied are the ways by which revolutionaries approach

Marxist ideology, come to accept it without reservations as the only guideline for their revolutionary struggle and all their activities. Many Indian revolutionaries came to the theory of scientific socialism through anti-imperialist nationalism after their disillusionment with the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership of the national liberation movement, by overcoming with the aid of the Comintern and Lenin and the Indian Communist Party founded in 1925 their nationalism and petty-bourgeois mentality in the process of the development of the social and class struggle in India itself.

There was yet another feature which became manifest during the formation of the Indian Marxist ranks. It was not specific for India, but India's socio-economic and political conditions not infrequently led to the infection of some early Indian Communists with a persistent form of the "infantile disorder" of leftism. Lenin revealed with utmost clarity and profound tactfulness the reasons for the theoretical untenability of the views of some Indian and other revolutionaries, who were operating under economically and socially immature conditions, which generated various forms of opportunism and nationalism. This should be taken into consideration when speaking of some early Indian Communists, who had come from the midst of petty-bourgeois national-revolutionaries, and who exhibited later, in the 1920s and 1930s, notable digressions from Marxism and proletarian internationalism. Lenin wrote in this context: "Economic relations which are backward, or which lag in their development, constantly lead to the appearance of supporters of the labour movement who assimilate only certain aspects of Marxism, only certain parts of the new world outlook, or individual slogans and demands, being unable to make a determined break with all the traditions of the bourgeois world outlook in general and the bourgeois-democratic world outlook in particular."*

The leftist sectarian views of the early Indian Communists manifested themselves in the early twenties. Manabendra Nath Roy, one of the leaders of the first communist group, denied the possibility and necessity of setting up a united anti-imperialist front with India's national bourgeoisie, which was at the head of the national liberation struggle in that

* V. I. Lenin, "Differences in the European Labour Movement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 348.

period. He called for an immediate socialist revolution in the belief that it must and could be called forth with the aid of an intervention from abroad by the armed forces of the Russian Revolution. Guided by these leftist sectarian views, Roy and his followers were leading in fact the emerging Indian communist movement towards isolation from the masses, deprived it of allies in the struggle against imperialism. They interfered with its setting up broad ties with the working class, the working people, who were following in that period the Indian National Congress party and Mahatma Gandhi rather than the little-known communist groups wielding little influence.

In his criticism of the sectarian mistakes of Roy and other lefts at the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin put forward the fundamental principles of the policy of a united anti-imperialist front which, in his opinion, the Communists should pursue in the Eastern countries. While preserving the organisational, ideological and political independence, even in the most rudimentary form, it was mandatory to cooperate with the national-bourgeois and petty-bourgeois national-revolutionary parties with the object of a joint struggle against British imperialism—such was the demand of the time. The establishment of tactical unity with these parties was required historically by the level and tasks of the movement and was an effective form of uniting the anti-imperialist forces fighting against foreign oppression and simultaneously a means of approach by the Communists to the working masses in order to awaken them to a struggle for their social liberation.

Since its line was rejected by the Second Congress of the Comintern, the Roy group proclaimed itself in favour of cooperation between all anti-imperialist forces in India. As experience demonstrated, however, it adhered to its old concept that the Communists alone should be in the vanguard of the national-revolutionary struggle because in their opinion it would assume an exclusively socio-class character in the immediate future, and this would lead to deliverance from bourgeois “sentimental nationalism” allegedly unpopular among the masses. The idea of calling an All-India Revolutionary Congress suggested by Roy was intended not so much to unite members of the Indian anti-imperialist movement as to speed up its transition to a socialist revolution. The attempt to carry this unrealistic idea into effect in 1921 natu-

rally failed. Roy and his followers were unable to agree on calling an All-India Revolutionary Congress not only with the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders of the national liberation movement in India but also with emigré Indian revolutionary democrats, many of whom were gradually tending towards Marxism. The emigration was in a process of differentiation. The Leninist position was attracting numerous supporters, and a group was being crystallised which sought to use united front tactics in practice.

The early Indian Communists, just as the first Communists in many other countries of the East had still inadequately assimilated Marxist-Leninist theory but they sincerely wished to adopt Marxist ideology. They were well aware of the need, without leaving the battlefield, to study the ideology and practices of scientific socialism. The Comintern afforded them this opportunity by opening the Communist University of the Working People of the East in Moscow early in 1921.

The works of Lenin and the activities of the Comintern had a great role to play in training the leading cadres of the communist movement, which was gradually turning into an independent factor of social life and the class struggle in the Eastern countries.

The Communists of India and other countries of the East assimilated more and more profoundly the Leninist strategy and tactics of the communist movement in the economically backward countries. Now that they have gained immense experience in their own struggle, they are guided by this strategy and tactics in their day-to-day activities. It should be pointed out in this context that as far back as 1922 a group of Indian Communists led by the young revolutionary internationalist S. A. Dange, now President of the National Council of the Communist Party of India, started the publication of the first Marxist newspaper *The Socialist* in Bombay. This was the beginning of a long and intensive struggle for the formation of an illegal party, for the practical application of the Marxist theory to the specific conditions of India.

It is significant that once it had become a large and influential political force, the Communist Party of India at its 9th Congress held late in 1971 put forward the task of "completing the national-democratic revolution" on the basis of a profound analysis of the Indian realities. The first outbreaks of this revolution were observed in the early 1920s. Consequently, the process of struggle for national political

independence took half a century, while Roy already at that time appealed for the establishment of a socialist state in India, skipping all the stages and phases of the democratic revolution. In order that the national-democratic revolution might be completed, the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of India called for setting up a united national-democratic front of the workers, peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the non-monopolistic strata of the national bourgeoisie. In the Communists' opinion, it would be possible within the framework of this front to mobilise the masses to the struggle for implementing the long-overdue economic and political reforms.

Roy also failed to understand the essence of the Leninist conception of a non-capitalist way of development for the undeveloped countries. He believed that the Communists were obliged to ensure an immediate growing over of a national liberation into a socialist revolution. Immature, unrealistic slogans to stimulate the revolutionary process artificially, regardless of the actual social and political situation and hence subjectivism and avant-gardism in strategy and tactics—such were the characteristic features of the left sectarian deviations from the Leninist line of setting up a united anti-imperialist front in the national liberation movement.

The Communist Party of India in our day appeals for implementing such radical socio-economic changes which can, through nationalisation of the monopolies, integration of the numerically predominant small capitalist production and cooperation of peasants, hold back and later stop the country's further capitalist development and direct it along a socialist path.

Not the seizure of leadership of the revolutionary struggle from the very outset, for which Roy called in 1920, but a long and hard struggle for establishing an alliance between the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie, for advancing the working class as the vanguard force in the process of its revolutionary work in cooperation with other classes and social groups against imperialism, monopolies and reaction, for the country's socio-economic transformation on progressive lines—such is the logic of actual struggle in contrast to an imaginary one. Not an immediate socialist revolution on which Roy oriented the Indian revolutionaries, although there was not yet any organised communist move-

ment in the country, but the formation of a united front of progressive and democratic forces, the establishment of a national-democratic system for which the Communist Party of India is calling today.

Such is the irony of the historical destiny of the untenable political formulations by Roy who attempted to correct Lenin and the Comintern.

Lenin's magnificent teaching, tested by time and verified by struggle, on the tactics of a united front of all anti-imperialist forces in the countries of the East is valid to this day and is an invaluable guide for the Communists of India. Needless to say, the presentation and solution of the problem of a united front of anti-imperialist forces under present conditions differ essentially from those in the 1920s and 1930s, in the period of the emergence and organisational formation of the communist movement. The Communist Party of India, just as the Communist parties of other countries of the East, is handling this problem taking account of its own experience and the characteristic features of our time, in conformity with the radical change in the alignment of forces on the world scene.

As for the left sectarian views of Roy and some of his followers of that time, now such views may be encountered in declarations of various epigones of petty-bourgeois socialism and nationalism.

The life of Indian emigrants in the Soviet Union and the assistance given them by the Soviet government show how the alliance of Soviet Russia with the revolutionary forces of the East took shape. Today this alliance has become global. It expresses the unity of the socialist community with the anti-imperialist forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have received thereby powerful support for their unremitting struggle against imperialism.

The New Burma

The Programme of National Resurrection*

The proclamation of independence in 1948 posed the question of the ways of Burma's further development. The left wing of the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League—the Communist Party and the revolutionary democrats—took a stand for a socialist, and the bourgeois leadership of the league, for a capitalist path of development. The conflict between them became increasingly bitter and later irreconcilable. Under pressure from the imperialists domestic reaction unleashed a civil war. The Communist Party of Burma was forced to go into hiding; the ruling quarters declared it illegal and clamped down on the Communists and their sympathisers. It so happened that for a long time the armed resistance of the forces of the National Democratic United Front to the reign of terror of the bourgeois-landlord elite was the chief form of struggle for the working people's interests.

In the course of the class struggle in Burma a favourable situation developed for the consolidation of all progressive and democratic forces coming out for strengthening political independence, against imperialism and feudalism, for economic independence and a turn towards non-capitalist development. The former bourgeois governments exhibited no true willingness to end the civil war in the country. They invariably put the left forces in a situation where the latter had to defend themselves against attacks by the ruling circles

* Jointly with P. P. Anikeyev.

who went out of their way to try and crush the forces of resistance to growing national capitalism which increasingly tended towards a compromise deal with US and British capital, the local princes and feudals.

During the period of more than ten years that the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League was in power it was impossible to solve a single major internal problem. The key positions in the economy were still held by foreign, mostly British, capital. The theory and practices of the so-called democratic socialism implemented by the governments of U Nu, U Kyaw Nyein and U Ba Swe fully discredited themselves. The plans of advancing the national economy failed one after another. Their objective was to intensify capitalist development. The situation of the masses deteriorated. The power in the autonomous national states remained in the hands of the feudal nobility, which pursued a policy of separatism and breaking up the Union of Burma. All this aroused discontent among the masses, added fuel to the class struggle, aggravated the contradictions within the ruling quarters. In defiance of the will of the people, the bourgeoisie set a course for stepping up the rates of developing Burmese capitalism on the basis of a compromise with the landlords and foreign capital. The bourgeois government suppressed the left opposition and attempted to crush the Communist Party and the organisations of the National Democratic United Front by force of arms, to consolidate the power of the bourgeoisie and the landlords. The efforts to achieve these objectives, however, were to no avail.

During the 14 years of independence Burma could not reach even its prewar, i.e. colonial, level of production either in town or country. The implementation of the land reform of a moderate type was suspended by the U Nu government. The capitalist path of development led Burma into an impasse. The false "classless" theory of building a "Welfare State" was a flop. The pressure from the Chan, Karen and other separatists demanding a secession from the Union of Burma increased. They set up links with SEATO and foreign intelligence services. The influence of foreign capital on the national economy and policy was growing.

The young state had a hard destiny. The government of the national bourgeoisie and the landlords failed to introduce essential changes in the social structure of the country, while the situation of the working people remained miserable. The

discontent of the working class was growing. The peasants were clamouring for a true implementation of the repeatedly promised agrarian reforms. A civil war flared up in a few areas of the country. The feudal separatists reared their heads in a number of ethnic districts. The organisations subsidised by international reaction stepped up their activity. The danger of a loss of national independence became real.

In that situation the high and middle-ranking patriotic military officers of anti-imperialist sentiments, closely linked with the mass of the rank-and-file servicemen, who expressed the national interests of the people and wished to serve their cause—the cause of struggle against imperialism and capitalism—carried out a political coup and dislodged the bourgeoisie from power.

On March 2, 1962 the power in Burma was vested in the Revolutionary Council. The change of government was not simply a military coup. It was the seizure of power from the hands of the bourgeoisie and the landlords by national democracy expressing the interests of the mass of the people. A period of political, social and economic reforms and sweeping changes began in Burma.

In April 1962 a policy statement entitled “The Burmese Road to Socialism” was published.

Early in 1963, roughly a year after the Revolutionary Council came to power, the Burma Socialist Programme Party (BSPP) published its philosophic platform called “The System of Correlation of Man and His Environment”.* This is an ideological and philosophic document. The publication by a ruling party of the principles of its world outlook, which is in itself a fairly rare occasion in international practice, is of considerable interest and has attracted the attention of world opinion. The main significance of the document lies in the fact that it attests to the sweeping changes in the direction of socialism now taking place in the ideological life of many peoples waging a national liberation struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

The impact of socialism on the national liberation movement is extremely great. The principles of scientific socialism largely determine also the inner social content of the national liberation movement, its evolution, its ideological, political and socio-economic platform, the direction of its further

* Rangoon, 1963.

development after the achievement of national independence, its choice of ideals and objectives, of the ways of socio-economic development. Socialism shows the liberated peoples the most effective means, tested by historical experience, of solving the most vital problems, namely, eradicating the grim heritage of the colonial past, overcoming the centuries-old backwardness and poverty, achieving economic independence, industrialising, cooperation, etc. Socialism demonstrated graphically and conclusively the possibility—predicted by Lenin in his time—for the undeveloped countries to build a new life on non-capitalist lines.

The internal prerequisites for non-capitalist development consist, above all, in the fact that in the majority of the countries liberated from colonial and semicolonial oppression capitalist relations have either not developed to any considerable degree (for instance, in most of the countries of Tropical Africa and Southeast Asia) or—even if they have become more or less deeply implanted—they have failed to win the positions of undivided domination (for instance, in Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, Burma, India, Pakistan, Algeria, etc.).

The main inner prerequisite for the non-capitalist development of the economically backward countries, however, is the will of the masses themselves. Having learned from their own sad experience the most inhuman and monstrous forms of capitalist exploitation by the colonialists and local capitalists, they are resolutely rejecting capitalism as a prospect for themselves. Socialism is the powerful centre of attraction to which the liberated countries are gravitating and into the orbit of which more and more peoples are being involved. The modern epoch opens before them an opportunity to take advantage of their specific internal conditions connected with underdevelopment or a nearly complete absence of the capitalist mode of production as a predominating system in order to take a step in the direction of non-capitalist development.

The realisation of all these objective, internal and external, prerequisites for a transition to a non-capitalist path of development is largely dependent on the subjective factor—the availability of a political force capable of leading the peoples of the backward countries along this path. In those colonial and semicolonial countries where the struggle for political independence was carried out under the leadership of the

working class and Marxist-Leninist parties, the national liberation revolution immediately after the abolition of foreign oppression grew over into a social revolution, which is the most radical and effective form of transition to a non-capitalist path of development. In the countries where the struggle for national independence was headed by non-proletarian forces, most commonly the national bourgeoisie, the right parties of the nationalistic type, the prospect of changing over to a non-capitalist path of development is realistic only after the dislodgement of pro-bourgeois government and a transition to the state of national democracy, in which the bourgeoisie no longer holds the key positions.

Experience demonstrates that in the majority of countries the revolutionary-democratic leading circles of the national liberation movement reject the capitalist path of development for their peoples and proclaim development in the direction of socialism as the only alternative acceptable to them. In their real expression, however, these declarations have essentially different meanings varying with the specific conditions prevailing in a given country.

Within the general framework of the national liberation movement there is considerable differentiation in the positions of the ruling regimes in the young Asian and African states. On the right flank are the countries where the power is in the hands of the reactionary feudal-landlord circles and the big bourgeoisie frankly oriented on capitalist development in alliance with imperialism. These countries have forfeited some important attributes of their national independence, and their ruling circles joined in the cold war and pursued a pro-imperialist foreign policy. Their reactionary internal policies were pervaded with the spirit of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

In the liberated countries standing on the left flank the key positions of power are held by the revolutionary-democratic sections pursuing an anti-imperialist policy and following a course towards non-capitalist development. Between these two flanks are the countries implementing a policy of independent capitalist development, limited socio-economic reforms of a bourgeois character, non-alignment or political neutrality on the international scene, at times with considerable inclinations towards a compromise with the Western capitalist powers.

The left wing of the national liberation movement natural-

ly evokes great interest. The leadership of the liberation movement here is mostly in the hands of the democratic, progressive sections of the people in town and country, the patriotic intelligentsia closely linked with the masses. In some of these countries the army, primarily the officers (i.e. the military intelligentsia), has assumed particularly great importance; it has real power in its hands and therefore it often takes the reins of government. In their struggle for power the democratic-minded army circles, the patriotic officers win over to their side the peasants, the workers and the petty bourgeoisie seeking to build up a social foundation for themselves and stand up to the pressure of the colonialists and exploiter classes. With these objectives in mind the patriotic officers may agree to implement a number of sweeping changes in social life leading to the expropriation of a more or less considerable section of the exploiter classes.

The measures implemented in the Union of Burma in the early 1960s are an example in point. Here the foundation of feudal-landlord property has been undermined, the large and medium-sized property of local and foreign capital has been nationalised, and on this basis a strong state sector is being established in the economy. The state has monopolised foreign trade, implemented cooperation in agriculture, taken certain measures to raise the living standards of the masses, to improve social and labour legislation, etc. These reforms are revolutionary-democratic in character. Naturally, the effectiveness of deep-going progressive reforms in such countries depends on the extent of the active involvement of definite progressive and democratic sections, the mass of the people. Without this the social basis for the regimes implementing a revolutionary, anti-imperialist policy is narrowed, and their political course may waver, as is sometimes the case, within wide limits.

In the present stage of the national liberation movement, however, it is precisely these countries that express the leading tendency of its development — one of struggle against imperialism and colonialism, the restriction and ousting of capitalist relations, the establishment of a national-democratic system to solve the most pressing problems on non-capitalist lines. These factors in the first place are exerting the decisive impact on the spiritual life of the young states, on the ideological interpretation by their theoreticians of the socio-economic processes in evidence there.

The ideological conceptions of the ruling quarters of the liberated nations have a complex and contradictory character. They represent a very specific scene of struggle between bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories and scientific socialism. Progressive and retrograde, ancient and modern views are entangled within them in a fantastic pattern. For example, the majority of the ruling national-revolutionary parties levy harsh criticism on feudal backwardness and its inevitable corollaries — spiritual inertness and ignorance, religious bigotry and obscurantism, the passive contemplative attitude to reality. These parties are in favour of broad education of the masses, propaganda of a rationalistic world outlook in conformity with the achievements of modern science and world culture, man's active involvement in shaping his own destiny and the destinies of his homeland. These parties denounce the imperialist plunder and colonial oppression, all forms of racial, national and religious discrimination; they are acting as champions of peace, friendship and cooperation among all peoples on earth; they reject the capitalist way of development for their peoples and proclaim the building of a socialist society as their central objective.

At the same time, their ideological doctrines bear an imprint of isolationism, nationalistic narrow-mindedness and inconsistency conditioned primarily by the weakness of the proletarian basis for the national liberation movement in these Asian and African countries. While denouncing religious fanaticism and obscurantism, the ideologists of some ruling parties not infrequently proclaim religion alone, if only in a "pure" form "liberated" from all prejudices, as the foundation of society's spiritual and material life and the sole force allegedly capable of delivering mankind from all social collisions. This was manifest especially strikingly after the victory of the national-democratic revolution in Libya, which overthrew the corrupt monarchy. While criticising the vices and ulcers of the capitalist system, admitting the achievements of socialism and its indisputable advantages over capitalism, and regarding socialism as a more rational form of the social order, they nevertheless often place socialism on a par with capitalism because both of them are allegedly concerned only with man's "worldly", material interests and ignore his higher spiritual requirements, which is said to be attributable to their common origin from the "materialistic" civilisation of the West, from Marxist materialism. Therefore, ideologists of

these ruling parties often proclaim "Western socialism" unacceptable for the "spiritualistic" peoples of the East and attempt to evolve their own variants of national socialism—Arab, African, Indian, Indonesian, etc.

As a rule, they absolutise in the process the community of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal interests of all the classes and sections of the people in the liberated countries and describe it as the absence of classes and class antagonisms. The ideologists of "national socialism" regard, as a rule, the so-called national historical traditions as the main factor of national unity, and since in societies with an undeveloped class structure these traditions usually wear a religious garb, "national socialism" not infrequently rests on the theoretical foundation of a specific religious-idealistic world outlook in a variety traditional to a given country: Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, local tribalist religious-mythological concepts (like Negritude in Africa preached by L. Senghor, etc.), which often generates ideas of "national exclusiveness" and its corollary—national chauvinism.

On similar soil there often grow the profoundly misguided and dangerous conceptions of the self-sustaining character of the national movement, which has allegedly neither an anti-imperialist nor social nature but is based on a certain community of the special interests of the "coloured" peoples of Asia and Africa. Inasmuch as this "community" is seen sometimes neither in the joint struggle against imperialism nor in the alliance of the Afro-Asian peoples with the socialist forces, the international working-class, communist and democratic movements, but in an artificial and far-fetched opposition of these peoples to "white imperialism", "the white West", the "hegemony of industrial powers", the "rich North", etc. (where the nations of the socialist community are also included), these ideological conceptions are impregnated to a varying degree with the venom of "coloured" racism, anti-Sovietism and anti-communism.

Practical experience has demonstrated that the petty-bourgeois, semiproletarian and declassed sections of the population in the Asian and African countries, who have not been steeled in class battles, in the movement of solidarity of all working people and proletarian internationalism, are more susceptible to nationalistic psychosis (which may occasionally infect unstable elements even within Communist parties).

Nevertheless, in spite of these tendencies, most of the ideo-

logical platforms of the ruling parties belonging to the left wing of the national liberation movement have on the whole a progressive, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character and reflect to a considerable extent the revolutionary-democratic sentiments of the masses, their protest against the exploitative order and their spontaneous gravitation to socialism. Although the ideologists of the ruling parties of this wing often have incorrect notions of scientific socialism, they sincerely strive to grasp its true meaning and bring their own views nearer to it.

It is in this context that the philosophical platform of the Burma Socialist Programme Party is a subject of special interest.

The programme considers mostly philosophical problems, ranging from those of universal being to the moral-ethical problems. As for the concrete questions of the political and socio-economic organisation of modern Burma, they are not widely covered in the programme and are analysed in other policy documents of the party.

The ideological sources of the programme lie to a definite extent in the national spiritual heritage (in the case in question it takes the form of Hinayana Buddhism), Marxism-Leninism, and some Western doctrines. The latter have found their way here primarily in the form of bourgeois individualism in its Bentham-Mill variant of utilitarianism and reasonable egoism.

The main thing is that the programme shows a very tangible influence of scientific socialism, which one way or other determines the selection and presentation of the main philosophical problems and the mode of their solution.

The programme in question differs favourably from other (eclectic) ideological doctrines in some very essential elements. In contrast to many theories of Afro-Asian nationalism the programme of the Burma Socialist Programme Party has the following distinctive features:

- it accuses imperialism of aggressiveness, of generating international tensions and the threat of thermonuclear war;
- it is free from anti-communism, anti-Marxism or anti-Sovietism;
- it outlines a radical solution to the central problem of socio-economic reforms, that of the character of ownership in all the spheres of socio-economic life;
- it does not proclaim religion in whatever form (“puri-

fied" or traditionally orthodox) as the spiritual basis for social and individual life. "The philosophy of our party is a purely earthly and human doctrine. It is neither religious nor supernatural.... It must be regarded and studied only as a mundane affair."

What is more, the ontological and epistemological principles put forward in the programme, despite their occasional eclecticism, have an essentially materialistic character as regards their treatment of the main philosophical issue—which is a fairly rare phenomenon among the ideological programmes of the ruling parties of the non-socialist countries in Asia and Africa. This circumstance may be partly attributable to the character of the form of Buddhism prevailing in Burma (the so-called early, southern or Hinayana Buddhism), in which the religious-mystical tendencies (characteristic of the later, northern or Mahayanistic Buddhism of India, China, Japan, etc.) have not become widespread, and whose leading schools (Sarvastivada, Vaibhashika, Sautrantika) preached naive realism and materialism. This, however, is only a partial cause. The main cause is the fact that the programme is deliberately, if not always consistently, oriented on the philosophy of "objective realism", materialism.

The programme upholds on the whole a materialistic outlook of the world, which it proclaims material in nature, independent of any divine or spiritual forces and having primacy in relation to consciousness. It recognises the infinity of matter in time and in space, the eternity of the motion of matter performed through leap-like transformations of slow quantitative accumulations into new qualitative states; the inner impulse of development consists of the interaction and struggle between antagonistic tendencies and constituents of matter. "Nature has neither a beginning nor an end; it has no alpha and omega." Human consciousness has specifics qualitatively different from matter but it is dependent and conditioned by matter. "The motion of his [man's—*R.U.*] mind depends on the aggregate of all matter; his mind cannot exist without this aggregate of matter on which it is constantly dependent." In its turn, consciousness has an active reciprocal influence on matter; consciousness originates from contact between the organs of sense with the objects of sense.

Despite the adoption in the programme of a number of fundamental tenets of dialectics, however, the materialism of its primary philosophical principles does not always cor-

respond to the level of modern scientific knowledge. For instance, its ontological foundation is the theory of the first four elements of being (earth, water, air, and fire or heat), which is traditional in Buddhism but hopelessly archaic today, and the largely unconvincing and eclectic division of all existing things into three worlds (material, animal, and the world of phenomena). In certain passages the laws of objective dialectics are expressed in the Buddhist conceptions, far from adequate to them, of the "constantly turning wheel of change" and the "dependent (conditioned) origin of things" ("pratitya samutpada"—the chain of causation). Although, according to Engels, these conceptions expressed in their time the spontaneous dialectics of the ancients, in the light of modern science they have to a considerable degree a naive, archaic character.

This inconsistency is characteristic to some extent of the treatment of the nature of human consciousness in the programme. It declares the dependence of consciousness on matter, but consciousness is devoid here of its main characteristic—the determining role of matter in its genesis and the functions of the object-sensory, practical activities of man as a social being. In the programme, therefore, consciousness appears mostly in its individual form, whereas in reality it functions only as conditioned by the entire aggregate of the system of social relations. Disregard for this circumstance and an attempt to establish a direct relation between matter and consciousness, ignoring social practice, are fraught with the danger of a dualistic separation of consciousness from matter and elevation of consciousness to an absolute, which is clearly traceable in the passages of the programme emphasising the active role of consciousness. This is evidenced, for instance, by such vague allegations as: "Matter is not the only source of states of consciousness, which arise from the causal action of matter, on the one hand, and the mind and mental factors, on the other, in their interconnection"; "in the process of change in man mental motion is much faster than material motion; the flight and motion of mind are faster than light, which travels at a speed of 186,000 miles per second. Thinking is a process of complex motion and a volitional act", etc.

These contradictions in the basic philosophical principles of the programme, their strong and weak points have a bearing also on its treatment of the problems of man and society, which occupy the central place in the programme. Its sociological part is based on the following main principles. Society

is in a process of constant change and development, the foundation of which is the interaction of material and spiritual factors, productive forces and production relations. The main motive force of social development and the producer of all material benefits is the people, the toiling masses: the peasantry, the industrial workers, the intelligentsia. "The working people have been the main social force of mankind throughout its history, hence history is not 'rajavamsha' (the history of kings) but the history of the working people." In its historical development mankind has passed through the primitive communal, slave-owning, feudal and capitalist formations. The latter three are united by their characteristic contradiction between the social character of production and the private ownership of the implements and means of production, which generates the exploitation of man by man, social antagonisms and the class struggle, which has been tearing society apart throughout its civilised history. "The history of man is not only a history of states, nations, wars and personalities but also a history of the class struggle." Today, however, relations of private property and exploitation have become outdated and inhibit social progress, whose interests dictate the need to establish social, collective forms of ownership of the implements and means of production and to carry out a revolutionary transformation of life on socialist principles.

The programme allows for the possibility to accomplish a social revolution without recourse to armed coercion: "A peaceful victory of a strong majority over a weak minority, for instance, a mass struggle without an armed uprising." It is underscored in the programme that a situation of peace, the preservation of peace on earth, the deliverance of mankind from the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe are an indispensable prerequisite not only for social progress but also for the very existence of the human race. The authors of the programme wish to "make one aware of the possibility that the achievements of human civilisation may be destroyed by unprincipled vicious renegades".

Combination of centralism with the freedom of individual initiative is considered an important condition of the development of socialist society in the programme. "Society striving for progress needs to have these two characteristic features: centralism left to the state and the freedom of initiative left to individuals or the majority. Without centralism society tends towards anarchy. At the same time, without the freedom

of individual initiative society becomes mechanical, and its progress slows down". In bourgeois ideology such formulations on the freedom of individual initiative usually conceal an apology for private enterprise. The programme of the BSPP makes no reservations allowing for the existence of a private sector under socialism. It proclaims in one of its sections: "The exploitation of public enterprises by private owners is unnatural and may only lead to social antagonisms."

The programme includes many principles of scientific socialism regarding the economic organisation of socialist society: maximum satisfaction of the material, social and cultural requirements of the whole nation; planned, balanced development of the national economy; from each according to his ability, to each according to his work; a steady growth of labour productivity; socialist accumulation; a steady improvement in the living standards of the people along with a steady expansion of socialist production on the basis of scientific and technological progress.

All these major sociological principles, which are largely based on historical materialism, despite some dualism in the interpretation of the interaction of the material and spiritual factors of social life, the substitution of the concept of the role of the working people in general for the concept of the decisive role of the working class, etc. constitute a relatively strong aspect of the BSPP programme; they are indisputable evidence of its social progressiveness and revolutionary democratism.

The treatment in the programme of the problems of the individual and his relations with society is somewhat less conclusive, although it seeks to approach them from materialistic premises. The programme proclaims man the supreme product, the crown of all existing things, the "prototype of the three worlds", the microcosm epitomising all the infinity and variety of the macrocosm. The decisive element in the socialist remaking of society is man, an individual of lofty ethical qualities. "Good work requires positive people. Hence selection of positive cadres is the key to success and the decisive factor in implementing the programme effectively." While attaching great importance to the ethical image of man, the programme does not ignore his reciprocal dependence on the satisfaction of his material wants. "We firmly believe in the truism that sound ethics are possible only on a full stomach.... Just as it is correct to say that sound ethics are possible only

on a full stomach it is equally correct to say that only when people of impeccable morals are in the leadership can a programme of filling stomachs, in other words, a socialist programme be implemented." In this way, the programme emphasises rightly (although not without a measure of exaggeration) the idea of the sovereignty of the individual and his natural right to enjoy earthly benefits, which is a sound, hypersensitive reaction to the theory of the "self-negation" and "self-dissolution" of an individual being in the "being of the universe and the socium" preached by religious mysticism.

The elementary but indispensable premises of any humanism do not, speaking in general, arouse special objections but the programme goes at certain places to indubitable extremes, proclaiming the individual as such, the individual *per se*, the starting point, the primary cell, the first principle of the entire social organism, all social life. In the programme the individual sometimes appears as the determinant of society, made in his own image as his enlarged model and representing his psychological being. Thus, the individual has primacy in relation to society, which is his derivative and function. "Human society is nothing else but an institution of human beings organised by them in accordance with their codes of laws and conduct." "If the character of man and the laws of his development are comprehended, the character and the laws of his society can be comprehended also." "Man is the master and leader of history." Small wonder, therefore, that the programme in certain instances proclaims ethics and moral self-perfection a panacea for all social ills.

It is evidently under the influence of the Buddhist traditions that the programme regards man as an "egocentric animal", "whose collateral distinction is that he is also an altruistic social animal". At one place it is even alleged that the struggle between the egoistic and altruistic leanings in man is the meaning of social history: "Egoism and altruism in man, his intentions and efforts to get rid of burdens and restrictions operate as forces whose interaction determines the course of the history of human society."

By such moralising the programme unquestionably pays tribute to individualism and abstract humanism. This precludes it from revealing fully all the aspects of the process of interdependence and reciprocal influence of the individual and society in all their dialectical complexity and contradictions, when "the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each

single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations." *

Thus, the programme fails to conform to the criteria of a complete and logically consistent philosophical system in all of its parts; it slips into a number of digressions from its proclaimed principles. On the whole, however, the anti-capitalist tendency and radicalism of this document pervaded with revolutionary democratism and militant humanism give reason to regard it as an important achievement of progressive patriotic social thought in modern Burma. It sets out one of the schemes—necessary and practicable in the conditions of modern Burma—of non-capitalist development for economically backward nations.

Needless to say, any theoretical programme, however profound and radical it may be, does not by itself guarantee the progressiveness of the practical policy pursued by a given political regime. As real life shows, various turns and retreats are possible in this field. The economic policy and political practices of the Burmese leadership are confirming the feasibility of some basic principles of the programme in day-to-day life; nevertheless, it is evidently difficult to implement some key provisions of the programme. It is important to observe how this progressive course in social life set by the new revolutionary-democratic government over a decade ago is being pursued in practice.

* Karl Marx, *Theses on Feuerbach*, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 14.

The Burmese People in Search of a Path Towards Social Progress

As regards the scope of the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist social reforms carried out since 1963, Burma ranks high on the list of liberated countries which have rejected the path of capitalist development. The reforms being implemented in Burma are evidence to the effect that the country has sought to develop in accordance with the Revolutionary Council's declaration called "The Burmese Road to Socialism".

The measures of an anti-imperialist character were the major component of the socio-economic reforms. As far back as the end of 1962 the Revolutionary Council of Burma, an organisation of high-ranking army officers led by the Commander-in-Chief, General Ne Win, imposed a ban on foreign and private capitalist investments in the national economy. Simultaneously various forms of partnership of foreign and national capital were banned, too. In 1962 and 1963 the Burmese Government nationalised the oldest Anglo-Burmese oil company, 24 foreign and local private banks, the timber and woodworking industries and all British tin and tungsten mines.

In 1963 the process of nationalising foreign monopoly property in Burma entered its final stage. Only the British company Burma Corporation, involved in mining lead, zinc ore and silver, remained unaffected. This company, however, in which British capitalists owned 40 per cent of the stocks, was about to be nationalised, too. A certain number

of foreign capitalists engaged in the manufacture of building materials, soap and matches. The complete nationalisation of foreign banks, the concentration of all foreign trade in the hands of the state, the institution of a progressive income tax, placed at the end of 1963 the economic activities of a few remaining foreign and local capitalists under strict government control.

Radical reforms were implemented in the field of foreign trade. In 1963 the issuance of import licences to private firms was discontinued. Earlier the state had prohibited the participation of private capital in the exportation of major commodities. In 1964 the Burmese Government announced the nationalisation of all export trade. In this way both foreign and national capital were ousted not only from import but also from export trade.

Domestic trade also underwent quite serious changes. Private merchants were prohibited to buy up rice from peasants. As is known, rice is the main commodity of domestic trade, the trade exchanges between town and country, as well as of Burmese export, and hence a means of earning foreign currency. As it is the staple food of the population, the situation on the rice market was always decisive for the domestic market situation. The rice purchases were now in the hands of the state. In towns a big share of retail trade in rice still remained in private hands, all merchants were first placed under the control of local authorities, and later, since February 1964, the private rice trade was transferred to a commission basis on behalf and under the control of the state. Rice was sold at prices fixed by government agencies.

The Revolutionary Council issued a number of injunctions on control over trade in farm produce and on ousting private capitalist merchants from this sphere. A ban was imposed on private trade in unhulled rice, tobacco, jute, cotton, sesame, sugar cane.

Vigorous measures were also taken to expel private capital from the sphere of trade in manufactured goods. The petroleum products trade, which was controlled by British capital, was nationalised. Retail trade in manufactured goods was carried out through large government department stores, cooperative shops and registered merchants operating under state control. The supply of imported goods to big and medium private shopkeepers was stopped; they

were sold only in government shops. In response to the profiteering and subversive activities of the big merchants and compradores, the Revolutionary Council nationalised large and medium-sized shops at first in Rangoon and then throughout the country. The nationalisation did not apply to small and peddler trade registered with government agencies. Trade in rural areas and the purchases of farm produce from peasants were put in charge of agricultural cooperatives.

Important reforms were carried out in industry. A large number of private capitalist enterprises in arrears to the state on taxes or credits, as well as those whose owners sabotaged state legislation were nationalised. Although the capitalist sector was not nationalised in full, private enterprise in all industries was put under stringent government control.

Once all private banks were nationalised the state could use the banking system to control the activities of the private sector in industry and trade (particularly in agricultural raw materials and foodstuffs). In fact, after the nationalisation of large trade and industrial establishments the majority of local medium-sized and even small enterprises became directly dependent on the state.

The government transferred the private industries engaged in the primary processing of agricultural produce to operation to order, i.e. on a commission basis under state control at a very modest fee of 1-2 per cent. The state controlled private capitalist industry in the marketing field as well. Wholesale prices of manufactured goods were fixed by government agencies. With such an economic policy of the state the possibility of private capitalist trends taking the upper hand in industry and trade was ruled out. The way for developing state, public forms of the economy was cleared fairly well.

In the 1963/64 fiscal year a uniform progressive income tax was introduced. The tax on incomes over 100,000 kyats a year was assessed at 95 per cent and more, and on incomes over 300,000 kyats a year at 99 per cent. The maximum profit left after taxes is 14,000 kyats a year. At the time it was equivalent to the maximum annual earnings of a government official. By setting a strict limit to the incomes of the propertied classes the new income tax fully undermined the basis for private accumulation not only of large but also of medium-

sized capital and placed the private capitalist sector in a situation where it could no longer expand the reproduction of capital on its own basis or in partnership with foreign capital.

All these measures were implemented in a situation of growing resistance to the Revolutionary Council on the part of capitalist and reactionary elements. In response to the resistance of the propertied classes, in May 1964 the government had to withdraw from circulation banknotes of the value of 100 and 50 kyats. Such banknotes of the biggest denomination were mostly in the possession of merchants, industrialists, compradores, profiteers, feudals, and money-lenders. This withdrawal dealt a heavy blow to the economic positions of the exploiter elite of the Burmese society linked with foreign capital. A considerable share of its deposits it had providently withdrawn from the nationalised banks was expropriated. Simultaneously this resulted in an almost one half reduction in the amount of paper money in circulation. The government officially announced that these measures were taken to put an end to the concentration of large capital (loan, usurious and in the form of treasures) in the hands of local money-bags and speculators disorganising economic life, and foreign capitalists inside and outside the country.

The Revolutionary Council of Burma recognised the extreme urgency of the land problem and took a stand in favour of solving it in the interests of the toiling peasantry by setting up cooperative farms. Until the coming of the Revolutionary Council to power Burmese agriculture had developed along capitalist lines. The agrarian policy of the former governments contributed to this trend. Although it had weakened the positions of the parasitic landlords-recipients of rent, it failed to settle the agrarian question in favour of the peasants.

The main provisions in the agrarian programme of the Revolutionary Council were the implementation of a land reform, cooperation and mechanisation in agriculture, development of new lands and advancement of peasant agriculture with the aid of the state. In 1962 and 1963 the Revolutionary Council passed a number of laws and decisions preparatory to the land reform. Among them were a law on purchases of farm produce, a new law on the lease of land, a law on the protection of a peasant's rights, a decision on a considerable expansion of state agricultural credits to peasants, a law on

the state monopoly of domestic trade in staple agricultural products.

The new law on the lease of land from the very outset seriously weakened the landlords' influence on the tenancy relations in the rural areas. Under this law the right of tenure of land leased by landowners to land users was under the exclusive jurisdiction of the land committees, which were closed to landlords, merchants, money-lenders and even rich peasants. The peasant lease-holder ceased to be a temporary tenant and was granted the right of permanent lease of a specified plot of land. He was no longer a rightless share-cropper who might be evicted by the landowner.

Quite important was the law on the protection of a peasant's rights, which forbid landlords, merchants, money-lenders and rich peasants to expropriate a peasant's land, implements, livestock, property and harvest in reimbursement for debts or failure to pay rent or interest, as well as to take him to court on such claims. This law was intended to undermine the semi-feudal forms of exploitation of the peasants by the landlords, merchants and money-lenders. It precluded an increase in the semifeudal mortgage indebtedness which was a permanent means of exploitation of the Burmese peasantry by the landlords and money-lenders.

After the nationalisation of private banks the Revolutionary Council was in a position to grant the Burmese peasants in 1963 a credit of 700 million kyats, which was almost four times the size of the credit extended between 1961 and 1962. All this substantially weakened the positions of the landlords living on rent and limited the system of exploitation of the peasants by merchants, money-lenders and market dealers. These reforms, however, were in effect palliative measures and merely laid the groundwork for the abolition of landed estates. The latter still existed, and the landlords exacted a fairly large tribute from the peasants. What is more, in the Burmese villages there was an incipient process of gradual conversion of semifeudal landlords and money-lending merchants into agricultural capitalists, who organised their own farms and sought to use hired labour and machinery on a wider scale. This tendency aggravated the danger of capitalist development of the upper strata of the rural population.

Thus, the measures taken failed to dislodge the landlords completely from their economic and political positions and

to uproot the semifeudal and semicapitalist elements exploiting the Burmese peasants. The Revolutionary Council took steps to draw up a long-term agrarian programme, which was announced by its representatives at mass peasant seminars in 1963. The programme provided for handing over the land to the peasants in the coming few years. Although gradually, cooperation in the Burmese villages had been developed, the areas under crops expanded, and mechanisation and chemicalisation of agriculture introduced already after the First World War and on a wider scale after the Second. These processes, of course, affected the upper strata in the villages.

The importance of cooperation among the peasants is particularly great, since two-thirds of them are landless and land-hungry lease-holders or farm labourers. The agrarian programme of the Revolutionary Council attached great importance to mechanisation and chemicalisation. The Burmese Government bought a few thousand tractors from Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, organised the assembly of Czechoslovak and Soviet tractors in Burma, the production of spare parts and some agricultural implements. A network of machine and tractor stations was set up and the production of mineral fertilisers was increasing. Great significance was attached to the establishment of supply and marketing, credit and producers' agricultural cooperatives.

The initial changes in the socio-economic structure of the Burmese village were quite considerable. They fairly deeply affected the agrarian system, but the economic influence of the landlords, rich farmers, merchants and money-lenders as well as the feudal rent recipients, many of whom were absentee landlords, still remained quite appreciable in the mid-sixties. Nevertheless, the middle peasants, lease-holders, share-croppers, land-starved peasants, and farm labourers derived definite benefits from the agrarian measures implemented by the Revolutionary Council. The latter's efforts initially to limit and undermine the system of semifeudal and semicapitalist exploitation in villages and later to abolish it in accordance with the programme proclaimed were supported by the farm labourers, the poor and middle peasants.

Since March 1962 until the adoption of the new Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Burma and the formation of a civilian government the power had been in the hands

of the army which had a strength of over 100,000 officers and men. The high-ranking and senior officers and the army as a whole were headed by the Revolutionary Council. Army officers held later and are holding now the key posts in all the divisions of the apparatus of state administration and the economy.

The Burmese army formed and grew stronger in the course of the national liberation war. It was not a privileged military caste cultivated by the colonialists, but a people's army struggling against the Japanese and British imperialists. Among its founders were such revolutionary democrats as Burma's national hero Aung San, who was assassinated by the reactionaries, the Revolutionary Council's President Ne Win and other outstanding leaders of the national liberation struggle, the working-class and communist movement in Burma. During the long years of struggle against the colonialists the Burmese national army was trained in the spirit of patriotism, anti-colonialism, and anti-feudalism. The revolutionary democrats and the Communists jointly formed this army.

At the same time the former bourgeois governments for a long time attempted to incite the army against the Communists and revolutionary democrats by cultivating the spirit of anti-communism within its ranks. The army's strength at that time was in its close links with the masses. Its officers' corps was recruited in the main from the middle strata of the urban population, and the mass of the soldiers, from the toiling peasantry and the poor sections in towns. Many members of the Revolutionary Council of Burma have a long record of struggle against the British and Japanese imperialists. Even today the army has many conservative officers indoctrinated with anti-socialist ideology. Some army leaders who held reactionary, anti-socialist views were discharged and replaced by consistent patriots in the early period after the 1962 coup.

The Revolutionary Council cultivated in the army the spirit of struggle against imperialism and domestic reaction. The army was actively involved in the country's political and economic life, although its leaders were not, of course, sufficiently competent in these fields.

During the years of revolutionary government Burma has taken a long stride forward in its political and social development. The Revolutionary Council's measures had the char-

acter of general democratic reforms typical of the initial period of non-capitalist development.

The policy documents of the Revolutionary Council provided the basis for rallying the country's democratic forces and for its advancement along the path of social progress. However, in contrast to the "democratic socialism" of U Nu, whose policy statements distracted the popular masses from the class struggle for socialism and appealed for a reconciliation with their exploiters, the policy documents of the Revolutionary Council were based on the premise that the road to socialism lies through the class struggle and the abolition of exploitation of man by man.

The Revolutionary Council did not proclaim scientific socialism to be its ideology. It is for history to decide whether it was for the better or for the worse: it is the only judge in such issues. It has more than once played this role in many other countries and its verdict was invariably in favour of scientific socialism. As we have seen, however, individual important aspects of scientific socialism, the experience and practices of the period of transition to socialism in other countries have been taken into consideration to a definite extent in the policy documents of the Revolutionary Council. The line of the Burma Socialist Programme Party was aimed theoretically at knocking the ground from under the feet of the bourgeois-landlord reactionary opposition. It faced the champions of social progress in the interests of the toiling masses with the realistic task of rallying all anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-capitalist forces to a path of non-capitalist development.

The right reactionary and left extremist organisations launched a subversive campaign against the social reforms of the revolutionary government in an effort to topple it under the demagogic slogans of restoring parliamentary democracy and forming a so-called elected government, and went out of their way to prevent the establishment of civil peace in the country.

As soon as it came to power the Revolutionary Council was compelled to take measures against the reactionaries. Towards the beginning of 1964 the activities of the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League had virtually come to a standstill. The Revolutionary Council isolated the right reactionary leaders (U Ba Swe, U Kyaw Nyein, and others). Rank-and-file members of the Anti-Fascist League started

quitting its ranks. The Revolutionary Council achieved definite political successes in the struggle against the right reactionary forces. It disbanded all right-wing parties and organisations, closed down the propaganda centres of foreign missions. It imposed a ban on the activities of the Ford and the Asia Foundations (USA), the British Council, terminated the "cultural" exchanges under the Fulbright programme, rejected the proposals of the American Peace Corps. The Revolutionary Council forbid religious organisations to engage in politics.

The primary and secondary school curricula and textbooks were revised to end the bourgeois influence on young people. A uniform programme of socialist orientation was introduced in schools. A university reform was carried out, too. The universities were placed under state control. A course in the political economy and philosophy of socialism was incorporated into the University curricula in conformity with the documents of the Burma Socialist Programme Party. The Revolutionary Council and its local branches carried out wide-scale activities among the peasants, workers and the intelligentsia. At public seminars for peasants and workers the problems of their participation in building a new life were discussed under the guidance of leading members of the Revolutionary Council.

Substantial changes were in evidence in the life of the working class of the manufacturing and mining industries and the transport services. In the mid-sixties it contained about 200,000 members, i.e. roughly 2 per cent of the gainfully employed population. The agricultural proletariat had about 1.5 million members. The number of workers employed in state enterprises was growing, and the structure of the working class was changing. In May 1964 the Revolutionary Council published the Law of the Worker's Fundamental Rights and Responsibilities and approved the Charter of the People's Worker Councils. Both documents were keynoted by the idea of the unity of the workers and peasants and appealed for the construction of socialism. The Charter provided for setting up a united workers' organisation. The people's peasant councils modelled on the people's worker councils were set up throughout the country.

The organisation of the people's worker and peasant councils, the promulgation of the Law of the Worker's Fundamental Rights and Responsibilities were crucially important

developments in Burma's political and social life. These measures united the working classes of the Burmese society and became the foundation of their political unity. The peasants and the workers came forward as the main force of the country's development.

Much depended on the Burma Socialist Programme Party organised by the Revolutionary Council, on its ability to assimilate the best and most progressive achievements and prevent its infiltration by bourgeois leaders, corrupt politicians and opportunists. Hundreds of thousands of people applied for admission to the party. Whereas formerly new members were recruited almost exclusively among servicemen, mostly officers, later admission was opened to a certain extent to civilians as well. Many political figures who had for years been active within the working-class and national liberation movement joined the party. The Revolutionary Council made every effort to widen its influence on the working classes. In contrast, the right-wing opposition and reactionary forces sought to recruit supporters among rich peasants, the middle and petty bourgeoisie in towns, particularly among merchants of ethnic minorities—Indians, Chinese, Pakistanis. The new political line was also opposed by many high-ranking members of the monastic community of over 300,000 men. The right-wing opposition had followers among conservative government officials, who sabotaged the Revolutionary Council's line and often thwarted its measures undertaken in the interests of the masses. The problem of building up a state apparatus fully conforming to the purposes of Burma's progressive development was complicated and took time to solve. It was worked out gradually by widening the training of cadres at schools and other educational institutions, at special courses sponsored by the Burma Socialist Programme Party throughout the country.

The peoples of Burma are vitally interested in establishing a socialist system. The fifteen years of bourgeois government opened their eyes to the fact that capitalism will not deliver them from poverty, social humiliation and exploitation.

Burma's experience in the 1960s evidenced that radical revolutionary measures to direct the country along a non-capitalist path of development were necessary to change the social structure of society and improve the situation of the working classes. By virtue of a number of specific his-

torical and political features of the class struggle in Burma this transition to non-capitalist development was started under the leadership of the national army and a revolutionary-democratic party, pursuing a progressive policy of restructuring the Burmese society. The masses involved in the struggle against feudalism, imperialism and capitalism also moved in the direction of socialism as a result of the persistent activities carried out by Burma's Marxists-Leninists in the midst of the proletariat and broad sections of the people for many years. The national revolution which did away with the domination of foreign imperialism has steadily grown into a social revolution directed against the exploitation of man by man in whatever form. The genuine Marxists-Leninists and the genuine revolutionary-democratic patriots naturally strove for unity in order to build a new Burma.

The Results of the First Decade

The main result of this period is the serious changes which have taken place in the class character of government and its social foundation. The alignment of class forces has changed, which has its economic expression in the new correlation between the state and private capitalist sectors in the economy. The state system, the party and political structure have changed, and fundamental changes have been effected in the agrarian relations, public education, higher schools, public health, the trade unions, mass organisations, etc.

The reforms had an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-capitalist orientation; a number of reforms were of a revolutionary-democratic character and oriented towards socialism.

The fact that the revolutionary takeover of power took the form of a military coup later supported by the mass of the people played a definite positive role, particularly in the initial stage. The leading role of the army in the revolution of 1962 prevented a bloodshed. No reactionary class or political organisation of the exploiter strata ventured to put up anything like serious resistance. The revolutionary army ensured for the new regime a situation of relative internal security and stability, in spite of the fact that armed forces of separatists of a feudal-nationalistic kind, as well as the "White Flag" and the "Red Flag" units, were fighting the regime, mostly on a cue from abroad in many areas of the country.

The military leadership of the revolutionary process in the country, however, had its negative aspects which soon became obvious. The domination of the army resulted in the spread of specific military methods, whereby decisions were taken and carried out exclusively in a centralised way by direct "frontal attacks" on the complicated technological and economic problems, the problems of developing the educational services, the spiritual and cultural life of the people, particularly the youth. The corollary of all this was that the initiative of the civilian population was largely ignored.

Burma's new leaders declared already in 1962 that the military forms of leadership were undesirable in principle and that the leadership should be vested in a revolutionary political party. The Revolutionary Council took a decision to set up the Burma Socialist Programme Party. The implementation of this decision, however, was slow and it was not until the early 1970s that some progress was made in this direction.

When the reins of power are held by the army it is not a simple matter to assess the merits of this power and its social foundation. The progressive character of the changes in Burma's social order, however, is indisputable, and the character of government there may be assessed from this angle.

The bourgeois-landlord and feudal-tribal circles no longer hold the key positions in politics or economy. The abolition of the landlords' right to dispose of their estates at their discretion, to evict peasant lease-holders and to exact rent dealt a mortal blow to the landlord property rights. Having lost their traditional feudal rights, many landlords left their country estates and settled in towns. The feudals in the ethnic provinces who constituted the core of the separatist movement and permanent opposition to Rangoon were also deprived of their privileges. From the very outset the Revolutionary Council relied on the working people in implementing its policy.

The radical change in the alignment of class forces in Burma in the early 1970s as compared with 1962 consisted in that the propertied classes were no longer at the top of the socio-political ladder, whereas the political status and moral prestige of the working classes were elevated considerably, though their practical role in the administration of state remained quite limited.

The social characteristics of the state sector in the economy

also changed. Until 1962 it had been a state capitalist sector which catered to the interests of the national bourgeoisie, landed capitalists and the bourgeois bureaucracy. Later it assumed an anti-imperialist and to a definite degree an anti-capitalist character.

The reformatory activities of the Revolutionary Council are carried out in an extremely complicated situation. A civil war in the form of a guerilla movement, which dies down in one area and then flares up in another, has entered its third decade in the country. Most of these areas are along the border with the People's Republic of China, and Thailand. The guerilla movement incorporates both leftist and right elements (Karen, Shan, and other separatists). Anti-government underground activities are also in evidence. The armed leftist and bourgeois-landlord opposition attempted to knock together a "national liberation front" of a broad spectrum of opponents of the present regime.

Initially the Revolutionary Council expected to cooperate with patriotic members of the former political parties. These hopes, however, did not come true. The right separatist and left extremist guerilla organisations stepped up the armed struggle against the Revolutionary Council. The main force of the underground—the "White Flag" organisation—displayed a special vehemency.

After the failure of the talks with the guerillas in 1963 the Revolutionary Council, faced with the fact of opposition from various subversive political forces, officially introduced a one-party political system in March 1964. All political parties and organisations including the trade unions were disbanded, with the exception of the Burma Socialist Programme Party, set up by the Revolutionary Council, and new mass organisations—the people's worker and peasant councils operating under the guidance of the BSPP.

When the BSPP met in its first congress in mid-1971 the new party organisation structure had assumed a relatively complete form. There were 73,000 members and 261,000 candidate members in the party. Over 42,000 party members were servicemen, 20,300 office and factory workers (the latter constituted the minority), 8,200 peasants and 2,200 professionals and "other working people". Party organisations existed in all the 313 districts, and party cells were set up at many enterprises, institutions and in the army. As regards its composition the party remained a military

organisation, which naturally affected its activities and relations with the masses.

The worker councils included over 1.5 million factory and office workers. About 6 million peasants and agricultural workers sat on the peasant councils. It should be noted that the structure of the mass political organisations was still in the formative stage, so in the early 1970s they had not yet become a daily operating socio-political mechanism nor had they been integrated harmoniously into the government system. It is a fact, however, that in Burma there has never been a more deep-going and socially important mass political movement based on the principle of democratic centralism.

The congress of the Burma Socialist Programme Party in 1971 was a new step towards its conversion from a small cadre party whose functionaries were appointed from above into a mass vanguard political force. The BSPP is to become a "mass people's party of all working people", the congress declared. The leading bodies of the party—the Central and the Inspection Committees—were elected for the first time. Most of the members of the Central Committee (120 out of 150) were servicemen, so the military character of party leadership was fully preserved. After the 1st Congress of the BSPP it was believed that although the power in Burma remained virtually in the hands of the Revolutionary Council, the latter recognised the party as the country's political leader.

The congress took a decision to draw up a new Constitution of the Burmese state based on the principles of socialist democracy and the directives of the four-year economic development plan for the fiscal years 1971/72-1974/75. The first plenary meeting of the Central Committee held while the congress was in session decided to widen the composition of the Revolutionary Council to 15 members, four of them civilians, and to set up a consultative body of civilians which was to give recommendation to the Council.

The Charter of the Burma Socialist Programme Party adopted by the congress reaffirmed Burma's socialist orientation: "The party shall strive to build socialism in the Union of Burma."

One cannot but note the social heterogeneity of the BSPP and the inadequate political maturity of its membership. Although the recognition of the programme "The Burmese Road to Socialism" is one of the main requirements for admission to the party, in fact, different political views coexist

within its ranks, ranging from right-wing social-democratic and petty-bourgeois to those of scientific socialism. The congress proclaimed consolidation of party unity a task of first priority, a sine qua non for the accomplishment of all other tasks. The party leadership appealed to its members "not to agree to a compromise to maintain artificial unity" and to overcome differences through discussion and criticism within the framework of intra-party democracy.

Ne Win declared at the congress: "It is mandatory to stress the significance of unity within the party which is playing the leading role, because disunity will be disastrous not only to the party but to the whole people as well. I repeat, therefore, that perfect unity must prevail within the party, and its activities should be based on a clearcut and correct world outlook. Internal unity is the key prerequisite for setting up a strong and close-knit party. Without this we shall be unable to accomplish our tasks."

It was emphasised at the congress that as a mass party the BSPP must take the lead in all activities in the political, economic and social fields and in the administration of state. Special attention was called to the need for the party functionaries to gain concrete knowledge and learn to work in a new way, and set up close ties with the masses. The political report of the Central Organising Committee of the BSPP said that the party should strengthen its leadership of the worker and peasant councils, that its members should make up the leading core in all class and mass organisations. The party declared its intention to widen its ranks primarily by admitting members of the "main classes"—peasants and workers. Great importance was attached to setting up a youth league.

The congress had quite important results. Its decisions changed the structural forms of the party leadership in Burma. The main bodies of the party—the Congress and the Central Committee—assumed authority based on the Charter. The role of civilians and civilian institutions in the system of leading bodies began to increase gradually. By all accounts, however, the army will retain its leading role in the party and state for a long time, although the growth of the BSPP through the admission of workers and peasants will gradually change the balance in favour of civilians. Members of the petty-bourgeois strata wield a measure of influence in the party; the proportion and political role of the workers and toiling peasants are still insignificant.

Among the key tasks the congress of the Burma Socialist Programme Party named the building of a "socialist democratic state", the consolidation of national unity, the remaking of the class and mass organisations on the principles of democratic centralism. The congress acknowledged the Revolutionary Council's declarations of its intention to hand over state power in the future to its "lawful sovereign — the people". The party's Central Committee was instructed to draw up the country's new Constitution, and its main principles were defined as follows:

- the goal of the state is socialism;
- the socialist economy is the country's foundation protected by legislation;
- the Constitution is based on socialist democracy;
- all the nationalities of the Union of Burma are determined to live in full unity and equality, under any conditions and in any situation;
- the working people enjoy both civil and personal rights within the framework of socialist democracy and conscientiously fulfil their duties to socialism and the state.

Thus the Constitution is called upon to legalise the country's socialist orientation and the new economic foundation of the state—state and cooperative ownership of the implements and means of production.

Great importance was attached to the achievement of national unity. Ne Win declared in his opening address to the congress: "Without this unity, whatever we may do, whatever plans we may make, our successes will be held back even if we avoid a complete fiasco."

The congress advanced no new programme on the national question. Since a separatist movement supported by hostile foreign forces seeking to destroy the Burmese state had existed in the country for a long time, the right of nations to self-determination up to secession was not brought up for discussion. The congress called on the Burmese to get rid of the chauvinistic sentiments towards ethnic minorities, to overcome national narrow-mindedness and strife, to achieve the unity of the peoples on the basis of equality and fraternal relations.

The congress pointed out that the internal political situation after the Revolutionary Council came to power was determined by the confrontation between three opposing forces: the Burma Socialist Programme Party led by the Revolu-

tionary Council; the right elements dislodged from power in 1962; the legal and illegal left elements. The left extremist forces (incorporating the "White Flag" organisation), as well as the right elements (rallied at the time behind the so-called United National Liberation Front led by U Nu), continued to wage an armed struggle against the Revolutionary Council and the Burma Socialist Programme Party. Accordingly the congress decisions referred to the need to defend the existing regime by force of arms.

As we see, the BSPP congress found no solution to the problem of restoring internal peace in Burma.

The 1st Congress of the Burma Socialist Programme Party defined its foreign policy as one of "strict neutrality". At the same time the congress referred to the need to take account of the fact that Burma is situated in an area of large-scale international conflicts, liberation wars, foreign aggression and foreign economic pressure, which compels the country to display special caution and to pursue a "balanced" foreign policy.

Burma's relations with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community are distinguished by a stable and positive character.

In 1967 there was an exacerbation in Sino-Burmese relations. They were normalised to a certain extent after General Ne Win's visit to China in 1971; simultaneously, an announcement was made about a resumption of suspended Chinese economic aid to Burma. In the same year Burma refused further American aid (under a 1957 agreement it had received certain quantities of American arms). The American-Burmese relations have been deteriorating throughout the last decade, and a ban has been imposed on the activities of a number of American organisations in Burma.

The foreign policy conception of Burma's "equal" attitude to the two world blocs is connected with an original interpretation of the political situation in Southeast Asia, which was in evidence at the congress of the Burma Socialist Programme Party. In Burma itself the progressive forces have pointed out that a pragmatic interpretation of the "national interests", underestimating some important general laws of the struggle for social progress, may result in self-isolation on the international scene and in other negative phenomena.

It is indisputable, however, that with all the specific characteristics of modern Burma (the foreign policy factor, and

the internal war lasting for years) taken into consideration the Burmese revolution is developing in line with the world revolutionary process and the departure of the countries of national democracy from capitalist orientation.

In the course of the class struggle the Revolutionary Council directed its main efforts to reorganising the socio-economic system and developing productive forces, in a situation of the continuing exhaustive civil war claiming great resources and diverting large sections of the working people from constructive work.

Whereas by the mid-60s the property of British capital and the companies of other imperialist powers had been fully nationalised (on redemption terms), and a ban had been imposed on new private foreign investments in the country, certain relaxations were later introduced in this field. Foreign investments are now made under strict government control.

In the same period nationalisation and restriction were applied to the capital owned by nationals of Asian countries (India, Pakistan, China, Singapore, Hongkong) which performed compradore, commercial and money-lending functions and was in the employ of the West European countries, the USA and Japan as a junior but the most predatory partner. This put an end to the most hateful form of exploitation of the Burmese people by foreign, particularly Asian, private capital during a whole century, which is a great achievement of the Burmese people and their leaders.

The declaration "The Burmese Road to Socialism" permits the functioning ("within reasonable limits") of private national enterprises "if they are contributing to the development of national productive forces". In fact in the mid-1960s the Revolutionary Council greatly limited the positions of local, national capital, a measure which was motivated by objective factors. Among them were: the compradore nature of the Burmese bourgeoisie, consisting basically of merchants and money-lenders exploiting small-commodity producers; the existence of a large bourgeois stratum (mostly of Chinese, Indian and Pakistani origin), which maintained close relations with foreign Asian capital; and the unwillingness of the bourgeoisie to collaborate with the new government, down to sabotage of the policy of the Revolutionary Council. It should be admitted that the restructuring of the semifeudal agrarian relations by abolishing the triple exploitation of the small-commodity peasant economy on the part of the landlords,

merchants and money-lenders using a pre-capitalist lease of land, usurious credit and trade was one of the most difficult tasks. Usury was banned completely as a penal offence, government agricultural credit was expanded considerably, and state monopoly was instituted on the purchases of a growing range of farm products. Diversified agricultural cooperation was being developed.

The Burmese government, abiding by the principle "The state is the supreme owner of the land", regarded land in the possession of private users primarily as an object of economic management. Fairly strict regulation of private landownership and land use was introduced.

The new land legislation in Burma and a number of other countries which have carried out an agrarian reform warrants the proposition that a variety of state national-democratic ownership of land, unknown heretofore, is emerging in the East, which is called upon to contribute to the gradual transition of agricultural production to the general line of non-capitalist development. This, of course, does not rule out differentiation of the peasantry and intensification of class polarisation. By the mid-1970s, however, pre-capitalist relations had been largely abolished in the villages of many Eastern countries.

The government sought to gain control of the home market thereby obtaining a powerful lever for increasing its economic influence on the development of the industrial and peasant economy.

The progressive socio-political forces in Burma are using the ways and means of abolishing feudalism and limiting private capitalist enterprise, of transforming subsistence and small-commodity production, which were practically used, taking it by and large, in many other countries. At the same time they are working out their own methods of struggle for progressive economic development. However, immense difficulties stood in the way of a broad introduction of new progressive forms of the economy. A vast number of new personnel capable of organising production on fundamentally new lines were required for the smooth functioning of the state and cooperative sectors. The small number of economic managers and administrators available to the Revolutionary Council were mostly ex-members of the old bureaucratic apparatus or ex-servicemen, and far less competent than was required by the modern standards of economic manage-

ment. Also evident was the haste in implementing the reforms, which was motivated first of all by the desire to uproot foreign Asian capital. Along with other factors unfavourable for Burma's economy (crop failures in 1966 and 1972, the currency, financial and energy crises in the capitalist countries), this had the result that the production achievements of state and cooperative enterprises, and of the Burmese economy as a whole, were far below what had been expected.

The current situation in Burma is quite complicated and contradictory: on the one hand, as a result of the progressive socio-economic reforms the country has unquestionably achieved definite progress, primarily in the social field; on the other hand, the economic, financial and currency situation deteriorated considerably, especially in the middle and the beginning of the latter half of the 1970s. Stagnation and even a slump in production in certain industries, the existence of idle productive capacities, the poor operation of the transport and communication services, the growth of unemployment, the reduction of real capital investments in the economy and the actually irretrievable spending of capital, shortages of consumer goods and the resulting growth of the black market (a peculiar discrepancy in the economy: goods shortages on the legal market, while anything is available on the black market), speculation and jacking up prices, an expansion of trade in smuggled goods, an increased deficit in the state finances, as well as in the balance of trade and payments, and inflation—such are the most characteristic symptoms in the country's economic life during the last few years. The unending insurgent movement and armed struggle are aggravating all these difficulties and are a grave obstacle to normalising economic and political life.

The causes of the difficulties experienced by the country are associated with a number of objective and subjective factors. The most important among them is indisputably the national economic strategy which has been based until now on a reliance on the domestic resources, the orientation in financing socio-economic development on the traditional ability of agriculture to produce surplus product, its channelling into the national development fund with the aid of a mechanism of low fixed state prices and the state monopoly of trade in the staple commodity—rice. The country's low level of socio-economic development and the absence of a solid material basis for accumulation (including the low export

potential), did not allow to rely on the domestic resources for a successful economic development. As for the second important component of this strategy—the exaction of resources from agriculture to meet the needs of the entire economy—it should be noted that the long-lasting, irrevocable, practically uncompensated pumping of resources out of the rural areas has demonstrated its negative aspect: the loss or weakening of stimuli to expanded reproduction among agricultural producers or their general inability to make accumulations and investments in farming. This has resulted in a practical stagnation of agricultural production.

The attendant causes of the deterioration of the economic situation are the unrealistic character of most planned assignments both for the physical and financial indicators, and the incompetence of some leaders in economic questions.

The chief causes of slow agricultural development are the predominance of small, low-productive and tiny farms (in the 1973/74 fiscal year farms with an area of up to 5 acres accounted for 62.4 per cent of the total number of farms, and those with an area of from 5 to 10 acres, for 24 per cent); the primitive agricultural techniques; the shortage of draught animals and transport vehicles; the extremely great dependence on weather conditions; the long-continued insecurity in the country; the small volume of capital investments; and the shortage of cheap agricultural credit. The low purchase prices did not stimulate the peasants to turn out more marketable produce while the inflation, price rises and the depreciation of money begun in the early 1970s even resulted in peasant farms reverting to subsistence economy in some areas. After the government had instituted its rice trade monopoly in the mid-1960s, rice purchases diminished from 3 million tons in 1963/64 to 1.5 million tons in 1971/72. In view of the growth of the urban population the government was compelled not only to reduce the export of rice but also to introduce its rationing. The curtailment of the export of the main commodity, which had brought in up to two-thirds of the total export earnings in the 1960s and thus provided the finance for imports, immediately produced negative consequences. A chain reaction was triggered off, which was quite difficult to stop. The reduction in imports, including commodities for production purposes, led to instability in domestic production due to the operation of enterprises, using imported raw materials, below capacity, and even to the closure of some of them.

There were stoppages in consumer goods supplies to the population, price rises, an expansion of profiteering and the black market, an increase in the state budget deficit (as a result of a fall in tax revenues), an increase in the mass of money in circulation, and inflation.

The low development rates in the key branch of the national economy had an adverse effect on the economy as a whole. Industry was also affected: its annual average growth rates were equal to 3 per cent between 1962 and 1970 and 1.1 per cent between 1970 and 1973. In the 1970s a decline in production was observed in almost all industries.

The deceleration of the growth rates was caused by a shortage of raw materials, the inadequate technological equipment of the majority of enterprises which had obsolescent plant, and the unwillingness of the private sector to make investments because of the high income tax.

The internal economic difficulties experienced by the country were reflected in its foreign trade. Its export potential dropped substantially from the pre-war level, particularly rapidly in the 1970s. The volume of export earnings determined the volume of import operations.

In 1975 exports diminished by 20 per cent and imports by one-third as compared with the period 1963-1964.*

In the 1973 calendar year the foreign exchange earnings from rice exports were a mere 75 million kyats since the government had to reduce them to an unprecedented minimum of 140,000 tons to relieve tensions on the home market although the world rice market situation was favourable and rice prices were high — two or three times those of 1970.**

The country's financial situation in the 1970s grew tenser year after year. The current expenses of the administrative bodies were growing, the ordinary incomes were declining and the state budget deficit was increasing.

The steadily increasing excess of expenditures over incomes resulted in a growth of government debt. In 1974 it reached 6.2 thousand million kyats as compared with 2.6 thousand million in 1965.***

* *U. N. Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, New York, December 1976, p. 120.

** *Ibid.*, p. XXIV.

*** Report to the Pyithu Hluttaw by the Government of the Union of Burma Socialist Republic on the Financial, Economic and Social Conditions for 1975-76, Rangoon, 1975, p. 148.

To lead the country out of this critical situation the government started introducing some changes in its domestic economic policy. Its decision to revise its agricultural policy was of great importance. Now it is determined to regard it as a matter of first priority in order to supply the growing population with food and to increase the export resources. The purchase prices of rice were raised three times—in 1973, 1974 and 1975; in 1975 they were 150 per cent higher than in 1972.

To stimulate rice sales by peasants to the state, in 1975 the government instituted an additional pay of roughly one-third of the purchase price over the fixed rates for the rice sold to the state over the stipulated amount. The state rice trade monopoly was somewhat relaxed. In December 1976 the state purchase prices were raised by an average of 40 per cent for ten types of other agricultural products—cotton, jute, maize, leguminous and other crops, whose procurement is also a state monopoly.

As a result of the measures taken, which evidently gave the peasants added incentives to increase production, as well as thanks to favourable weather conditions the harvest of unhulled rice in 1975/76 reached a record figure of 9.08 million tons. For the first time in the last decade the state rice purchases surpassed 3 million tons. There was also a steep rise in industrial production: 12.8 per cent in 1975/76 over the level of the year before thanks to the availability of the requisite quantities of local and imported raw materials (in 1975 import trade in raw materials was liberalised).

After an analysis of the causes of the economic difficulties the Burmese leadership already in the early 1970s took steps to eliminate them in the course of long-range planning, as is evidenced by the decisions taken on the questions of long-term and current planning by the 4th plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Burma Socialist Programme Party in September 1972 and the 2nd Congress of the BSPP in October 1973. The central goal proclaimed in the directives for the new 20-year perspective plan adopted by the 2nd Congress of the BSPP is to “build up the economic, social and political basis for socialism in the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma by 1994/95”. It is emphasised that measures to nationalise private property and limit the private sector in the economy will be implemented in Burma during this period. The following principle is advanced at the same time: “Changes in the structure of property should not interfere with the process

of production." The private sector will be allowed to operate on a broad scale in various spheres of the economy, particularly in agriculture. The quantity of production in the private sector is to be increased from 6,448 million to 9,210 million kyats. Its share in the gross national product, however, is to be reduced from 56.6 to 26 per cent. Thus, its own, at times bitter, experience has led the Burmese leadership to recognise the need for more flexible relations between the state and the private sector.

The central goals of the planned reforms will be further consolidation of the state and cooperative sectors in the economy, and improvement of the progressive forms of the public economy. At the same time, elements of the multistructural economy will be still present in Burma's economy in the early 1990s. The strategic task is to convert it into a well-coordinated, highly profitable and widely ramified economy based in the main on the country's internal resources of raw materials and capable of supplying the consumer market with sufficient quantities of food and manufactured goods, to ensure an increase in the export potential and a steady growth in foreign exchange earnings necessary for expanded reproduction, and to lay the foundation of heavy industry.

* * *

It is not without difficulties that the new society is emerging in Burma. They are generated by both internal and external causes. The radical forced change in the social conditions of life in the country, in the management of the affairs of state and the economy, the introduction of planning and the establishment of the state sector system are naturally resisted by the classes opposed to social progress. Internal reaction, which is sabotaging the implementation of progressive socioeconomic reforms, is trying to take advantage of the external difficulties. One can hardly doubt that the difficulties experienced by Burma are collateral to its development. Since the Burmese working people are actively supporting the policy of social progress, it should be presumed that these internal economic difficulties will be gradually overcome and that Burma will not surrender its positions of principle to the constant pressure from the multinational imperialist monopolies—the long-time enemies of the Burmese people.

The Embattled Africa

The Final Stage of the Collapse of Colonialism

Mankind's complete liberation from colonialism and the eradication of its last enclaves is an important task of today. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969 underscored the need to strengthen further the unity and solidarity among the fighters against colonialism. The meeting declared in its final document: "We call on all men of goodwill, on all supporters of democracy, to work together to do away with the vestiges of colonialism and to struggle against neo-colonialism. We urge effective internationalist measures in support of the patriots of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, in support of all oppressed peoples."*

In all the periods of its history the Soviet Union invariably came out in defence of the peoples of the colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries, and made a tremendous contribution to the abolition of colonialism on earth. From its early days the Soviet Union vigorously and steadfastly fought against all forms of national and racial oppression and inequality, for a recognition of the right of the oppressed and dependent nations to shape their own destinies, for the recognition of the legality of a struggle for freedom and independence, an armed struggle included.

The time has come for the final abolition of colonialism.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 34.

Dozens of sovereign states have arisen in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is well known that their emergence was not the result of any voluntary concession of independence to the colonies and semicolonies by the imperialist powers. The liberation struggle of the oppressed nations was bitterly opposed by imperialism. During the last 15 to 20 years, however, it has been developing in a situation extremely favourable for the champions of national independence and social progress. Unable to hold back their offensive, imperialism is dodging, camouflaging itself and retreating. It is forced to abandon its formerly impregnable political and economic positions.

The moral and political debacle suffered by imperialism is evidenced by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the 15th session of the UN General Assembly on December 14, 1960 on the Soviet Union's initiative and on the basis of the final draft submitted by 43 African and Asian states. The Declaration announced solemnly that it was mandatory to put an end without delay or reservations to colonialism in whatever form or manifestation. It was the first document in the history of international relations which denounced and outlawed colonialism in clear, unequivocal terms.

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples conformed in content and spirit to the vital interests of the oppressed nations and helped them in their struggle.

The Declaration rejected the attempts of the colonial powers to use the most cynical and threadbare argument of the colonialists concerning the allegedly inadequate political, economic and social maturity of some peoples as a pretext for procrastination in granting them independence. The Declaration stated that an intention to destroy partly or fully the national unity and territorial integrity of a country aspiring towards independence was incompatible with the goals and principles of the UN Charter. This was a well-aimed blow at the imperialists' provocative policy of stirring up tribal feuds and territorial and border disputes, and of sustaining separatist and subversive elements.

And finally, what is particularly important, the Declaration demands an end to any military operations and repressive actions against the dependent peoples. This means the proclamation of such actions as illegal and the recognition of all forms

of resistance to colonial domination without exception as lawful.

Until the adoption of the UN Charter in 1945 international law had contained no universally recognised principles proclaiming the right of nations to self-determination and outlawing colonialism. The destinies of the colonial peoples were regarded as an internal affair of the metropolitan countries. By proclaiming the principle of the equality and sovereignty of nations the UN Charter thereby widened the sphere of application of international law.

It took years of continuous and intense struggle against colonialism on all fronts, however, for the consistently democratic anti-colonialist interpretation which was attached to the UN Charter by the USSR and other socialist countries, by all fighters for national liberation and social progress to be formally recognised in the UN Declaration adopted by the General Assembly in 1960.

The ground for the universal denunciation of colonialism in international law had been prepared by the emergence and development of the world socialist system, the powerful upsurge of the liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which had dealt truly devastating blows to imperialism. During the period between the two world wars, after the Great October Socialist Revolution the national liberation movement had given rise to a relatively small group of newly-independent states. After the Second World War this process assumed a widespread character, as it had been caused by the progression of the crisis of the colonial system to its full disintegration.

In the latter half of the 1950s the decolonisation process was greatly influenced by the Egyptian revolution, the debacle suffered by the tripartite imperialist aggression against Egypt in 1956, the victories of the Algerian and the Cuban revolutions, the Vietnamese people's heroic resistance to the aggressors, the Iraqi revolution of 1958, and the victory of the progressive forces in Syria. The peoples of these countries have demonstrated to the world that they are capable of repulsing armed aggression by imperialist interventionists and upholding their chosen path of independent development, leaning in their struggle on the support of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

The successes in the liberation struggle of the peoples led to a change in the alignment of forces in the United Nations.

This body was joined by new liberated states which are actively coming out for peace and national liberation and supporting the consistent anti-imperialist policy of the socialist countries.

All these circumstances have created an unprecedented and formerly impossible situation in which an anti-imperialist, anti-colonial declaration was imposed on the colonial imperialist powers at the UN General Assembly, and none of them ventured openly to oppose its adoption. The Declaration was carried by 90 votes. Its opponents — nine imperialist powers — did not dare to vote against it and simply abstained.

The years which elapsed since the Declaration was adopted have witnessed new successes in the process of decolonisation. Since the end of 1960 more than 20 new sovereign states have emerged on the African continent alone. The collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire under the blows of the national liberation movements and the democratic forces in the former metropolitan country was a great victory. New countries and territories have achieved independence in Asia, Latin America and Oceania.

The closing down of a number of foreign military bases in their territories was a substantial achievement of the countries in the process of liberation. These bases — the outposts of imperialism — are widely used to undermine their national independence and are a permanent source of international tensions. The closure and handing over of military bases to national governments was a great accomplishment of the national liberation movement.

Over the past years the liberated countries have made spectacular progress in developing their national economy and culture, in strengthening their economic and political independence, in setting up mutual ties and expanding friendship and cooperation with the socialist world. The orientation of a number of newly-liberated states on remaking society on socialist lines and on taking a non-capitalist path was a crucial factor in undermining the colonial system. It is precisely this new phenomenon that the imperialists regard as the most formidable threat to their interests.

Needless to say, it would be wrong to present the history of the national liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s as a smooth road, without considerable difficulties, defeats and setbacks.

* * *

In the 1960s the policy and practices of neocolonialism took shape as a system of measures to retain the former colonies and semicolonies within the world capitalist system, and to preserve on this basis the imperialist economic exploitation of the young states despite the formal recognition of their political sovereignty. Neocolonialism resorted in the past and is resorting today not only to unequal trade. It knocks together military-political blocs, organises conspiracies and coups d'état, resorts to blackmail and threats, an economic blockade in a variety of forms, military provocations and direct intervention. Neocolonialism makes alliances with internal reaction and takes advantage of any contradiction inside the developing countries to meet its own objectives, in particular, of separatist and tribalist tendencies, which are intensively instigated by the imperialists and have led to great disasters for the peoples of Indonesia, the Congo, Nigeria, and a number of other countries.

Enclaves of colonialism, which is openly battling the liberation forces, have still survived in the world. The racist government of the Republic of South Africa, which is pursuing the inhuman policy of apartheid, and illegal white minority government in Rhodesia are defying the national liberation movement and the United Nations. They are supplied with arms by the United States, Britain and the FRG and are carrying out increasingly cruel punitive operations against the freedom fighters.

New trials and historic victories expect the fighters for national liberation in the future. The last stage of the full and final collapse of colonialism has a number of characteristic features.

In the first place, the armed and political struggle against the enclaves of colonialism and racism in southern and western Africa has intensified, and the opposing forces have further polarised and consolidated, with the result that today not only its direct participants are involved in the conflict on this front of the struggle against colonialism. It is common knowledge that the racist regimes of the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia could not have existed and pursued their policies without the economic, political and military assistance from the leading imperialist powers having a vested interest in the economic exploitation of southern Africa

and regarding the preservation of the stronghold of colonialism and racialism in this region as an important factor in holding back the national liberation and socialist movements.

The preservation of the racist regimes threatens the existence of the peoples languishing under their yoke, as well as the entire continent. In pursuing their policy of aggression the South African racists increasingly encroach on the independence and sovereignty of the neighbouring countries and are creating a real danger to the peace and security of the African nations. The RSA organised the invasion of Southern Angola by white mercenaries from Namibia, moved its troops into Southern Rhodesia to prop up the racist Smith regime, concentrated large forces on the border with Mozambique; it was one of the initiators of setting up the South African flank of NATO. The anti-colonial movement at the present stage, however, is repulsing the imperialist interventionists and their puppets by military and political means.

The peoples and political leaders of the liberated countries are paying increasing attention to the constructive programme of national development. They have learned from their own experience that a formal proclamation of independence alone does not guarantee genuine national sovereignty, that independence should be accompanied by a systematic advancement of the economy, culture and living standards of the people, and by deep-going social reforms. In the views of many peoples and leaders of the developing countries the ideals of independence and progress are more and more closely associated with socialism. The enemies of social progress were inclined to ascribe the non-capitalist path of development to the whims of some radical national leaders and rejoiced at its temporary setbacks in some countries, such as Ghana and Mali. The latest events, however, the revolutionary reforms in the Southern Yemen, Ethiopia, Benin and Madagascar have conclusively shown how logical, promising and attractive this path is coming to be seen by many developing countries, particularly in Africa. The desire of many African countries to secure for the state the positions of control in the economy and limit the economic influence of imperialism, and the democratic changes which have taken place in the political life of a number of Asian countries are evidence to the effect that in our days the liberation movement cannot be separated from the struggle for democracy and social progress. The champions of apartheid are finding themselves

in increasing isolation. On the African continent they have lost their ally (Salazar's Portugal) and are losing prestige on the international scene even in the eyes of the Western world because of their adherence to reactionary methods of government.

The Organisation of African Unity has pledged to continue its assistance to the newly-liberated countries, which is necessary for their economic development and stepping up the struggle against apartheid. A high degree of efficiency of this assistance will be attained if it is not isolated from international support. The obsolete, moribund economic system in many countries of Africa is in need of radical changes. Africa's struggle for a change in the economic position of the liberated countries is being advanced to the foreground.

Feeling the ground slipping from under their feet, imperialist powers are resorting to dangerous adventures and to methods which have already shown their inability to check and throw back the liberation movement, in particular, the methods of maintaining a long-lasting local tension in international relations or local imperialist aggressions. Historical experience has demonstrated that the peoples who are asserting their freedom and relying on the sympathy and support of the socialist countries, and progressive mankind as a whole cannot be stopped by the imperialists' resistance.

All-round assistance from the USSR and other socialist countries is of prime importance for the national liberation movement. As the CC CPSU General Secretary Brezhnev stated at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, "the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, holds active positions in the wide and seething front of the national liberation movement, and renders firm political support and moral and material help to the peoples fighting for liberation".*

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 170.

The Characteristics of the Current Stage of the National Liberation Movement

Africa remains one of the most important and complex sectors of the front of the peoples' struggle for their national and social liberation. This struggle is taking place in a fundamentally new situation, where the sphere of the direct political domination of imperialism in Africa has sharply narrowed. It has lost almost all of its colonies on this continent. The shrinkage of the sphere of its political domination in Africa, however, does not solve the whole problem. It should always be borne in mind that the national liberation movement in Africa is developing irregularly and that it is not sufficiently strong and consistent everywhere to prevent a revival of colonialism in new forms. This is expressed, above all, in the fact that the abolition of the direct military and political colonial domination, i.e. foreign occupation, is attended by a considerable increase in the indirect, and at times quite dangerous, neocolonialist pressure against many African countries. Imperialism is retreating to positions placed in advance, from which it would be possible eventually to launch a counter-offensive against the national liberation forces. It expects to attain its objectives relying, on the one hand, on the methods of neocolonialism, which has enmeshed the majority of newly-independent states, mostly in Tropical Africa, and on the other hand, on the preservation and strengthening of the outposts of colonialism and racism in southern Africa.

Taking advantage of the economic difficulties and the shortages of modern equipment and skilled manpower experienced

by the majority of African countries building a new life, the old and new colonial powers are attempting an elastic counter-offensive draped in various forms of "aid" to recapture their lost positions or gain new ones. In the meantime they are seeking to disunite the African countries, to undermine the faith of their peoples in the possibility of independent development, to prevent the transition of new states to the path of social progress, to perpetuate the unequal, dependent position of these countries within the system of the world capitalist economy and to thwart the establishment of strong ties between them and the socialist world.

The policy of imperialism in Africa cannot be considered in isolation from other factors. This is a component of the general struggle waged by the reactionary forces against the progressive forces on an international scale. Imperialism is engaged in a massive effort to strike a blow at one of the young contingents of the national liberation movement, and to thwart the consolidation of national independence, the development of democracy and the spread of socialist ideas. The heightened activity of the imperialist circles in Africa in the last few years has been caused primarily by the important socio-political processes developing here. Suffice it to recall that most of the socialist-oriented countries pursuing a non-capitalist path of development are situated on this continent.

In addition to political goals the African policy of imperialism is motivated by major economic interests. For the Western powers Africa is well-nigh the only supplier of certain kinds of raw materials of crucial importance to modern industry. Africa accounts for one-third of the capitalist world's production of vanadium, copper, lithium, beryllium, niobium, antimony, for one half of manganese and tantalum, for two-thirds of gold and for almost the whole output of cobalt and diamonds.

The colonialists' attempts to preserve their domination in Africa and save their remaining positions there demonstrate the full extent of the imperialist, neocolonialist danger to the young independent states. This danger, the increased activity of imperialism in Africa was pointed out specifically at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, which said:

Imperialism "tries to halt the growth of the liberation struggle and preserve and strengthen its positions in that continent. The British and French imperialists, and the imperialists of

the USA, West Germany and Japan are making extensive use of neocolonialist methods of economic, political and ideological infiltration and subjugation. The armed intervention in the Congo (Kinshasa), the reactionary coups in Ghana and some other countries, imperialist moves designed to dismember Nigeria, the political and military support given to reactionary and anti-national cliques, to the fascist and racist regimes in the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, the fomenting of inter-state conflicts and inter-tribal strife, economic pressure and monopoly expansion — all serve to further imperialist plans.”*

This is why the struggle against colonialism and racialism makes up the main content of political life in Africa. The struggle to uproot the last colonial and racist regimes has international significance; it is the foundation of the militant unity of the African revolutionary movement with all the revolutionary and democratic forces of today, with the international working-class and communist movement, with the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole.

The US monopolies are taking the lead in the effort to check the progressive development of African revolution, to isolate it from the world revolutionary forces. The latest developments which have caused tensions in many areas of the continent and political instability in a number of African countries are conclusive evidence that US imperialism is a defender of everything that is reactionary and conservative in Africa. The US monopolies have repeatedly resorted to intimidation and blackmail, interfered in the internal affairs of independent African states, and have taken a hand in a series of reactionary military coups. The subversive activities of imperialism against African unity, its policy of active support for the racist and colonial regimes in southern Africa are a matter of common knowledge.

The military bases of imperialist powers remaining in several countries are causing grave concern in Africa. They are a tool of political pressure against the young independent states, above all those which have taken the path of social progress. The armed forces stationed at these bases may be used at any moment to suppress popular actions, and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states. The closing down of mili-

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, pp. 15-16.

tary bases has become a political slogan of the anti-imperialist struggle throughout the continent.

Although the vested interests of US imperialism in the continent are not as great as those of other Western powers (the investments of US monopolies are estimated roughly at 3.5 thousand million dollars out of the total of 22 thousand million), it is precisely the US monopolies that are masterminding the united front of the imperialist powers against the African national liberation movement. They are assisting the racists of the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia through the NATO machinery. Britain, Belgium and, to a certain extent, France have been compelled to surrender some of their positions in Africa to the United States in exchange for its support. In spite of their differences and contradictions on secondary issues, the imperialist policy-makers are seeking to operate in Africa in a united front. What is more, since the end of the Second World War the range of the capitalist states exploiting the natural resources and labour of the peoples of this continent has widened, in particular, by the accession of the FRG, Japan and Canada.

In view of the difficulties, mostly economic, suffered by many young African states, the old and new colonial powers expect to disunite the African countries, to erode their peoples' trust in the possibility of independent development, to carve up Africa into spheres of influence in line with the new balance of power in the inter-imperialist rivalry, and to prevent the transition of its peoples to a non-capitalist path of development. Relying on the feudal-conservative and bourgeois-reactionary forces, the social basis for imperialism and neocolonialism laid as far back as the period of colonial domination, and trying to strengthen and widen this basis in every way, the international monopolies, primarily those of the United States, are seeking to harness the liberated countries securely to the chariot of the world capitalist economy, to perpetuate and aggravate their unequal status within the system of the capitalist division of labour and to prevent strong regional economic ties between them, pursuing the aim of promoting the economic advance of the African continent, from being established and strengthened.

Africa's long-continued existence as an agrarian and raw materials appendage of the imperialist powers has had a pernicious effect on its economic development. The need to overcome this lag within a historically brief space of time

compels independent African states to request foreign aid, since they are short of capital, skilled manpower and managerial know-how. Cooperation with the socialist world has been a new, favourable factor. Now the liberated African countries are in a position to claim better terms of foreign economic relations, even within the framework of the world capitalist market.

The formation of the world system of socialist states and the disintegration of the colonial system have radically changed the conditions for the continued development of the economically backward countries. Having broken free of the chains of colonial slavery they have scored the first, at times quite spectacular, successes in their struggle for economic independence. The economic monopoly of foreign capital both inside these countries and in their relations with other states has largely been undermined. In their relations with imperialist powers they are able to oppose the latter's colonialist ambitions by relying on all-round cooperation with the world socialist system, and the growing anti-colonial solidarity of the Afro-Asian countries, which consolidates substantially the positions of the developing countries in their struggle to strengthen their political independence on the basis of a progressive restructuring of their national economies. Today the after-effects of colonialism are manifest primarily in the fact that the imperialist powers and foreign monopolies still retain strong positions in key economic sectors in the developing countries.

This is precisely the reason why in the economically backward countries, which have gained political but not yet economic independence, imperialism seeks to recapture in whatever form some of its former political positions, opposes fiercely the progressive forces struggling for complete national liberation and economic independence, tries to bring them to their knees or at least to make them retreat. To prop up its positions in these countries foreign capital takes advantage of the backwardness of their agriculture, food shortages, the difficulties of industrialisation, the enormous relative agrarian overpopulation and unemployment, the unfavourable balance of foreign trade, low revenues, the partial or slow implementation of agrarian reforms, and the extremely low living standards of the people consequent on general economic backwardness. Hence the constant need for stubborn and consistent efforts to heal the economic sores caused by colonialism. The recognition of nationalisation as an inalienable right of sover-

eign states and a lawful means of strengthening their independence, the widening of economic cooperation between Asian and African states, renunciation of fettering terms of aid causing harm to national independence and state sovereignty, the striving to pursue an industrialisation policy by building up state industry and implementing socio-economic reforms are evidence to the effect that the progressive forces in the African countries are fully aware of the need to wage a consistent struggle against the economic domination of foreign capital, which is the main factor, constantly felt and renewed, sometimes on an expanded basis, in the foreign exploitation of the natural resources and labour in the developing countries.

The liberated peoples of Africa have realised that the imperialists are unwilling to reconcile themselves to the abolition of their colonial domination and the inevitable downfall of the political regimes they have created. The gradual decline of the economic monopoly of imperialism in Africa, however differently this process may develop in different countries, is historically inevitable and is the logical result of the existence and development of the world system of socialism and the formation of independent national states on the ruins of colonialism.

The need to end economic dependence on the imperialist states and to uproot the feudal and semifeudal survivals causing poverty among the masses objectively requires that the developing countries should begin building up state industry and implement agrarian reforms. The peoples which have attained independence are aware that it is impossible further to strengthen their sovereignty and raise their standards of living not only without a consistent anti-imperialist struggle in the field of political relations with the imperialist countries but also without ending their economic dependence on imperialism. Fully determined to continue their fight against all forms of colonialism and imperialism, they deem it necessary to guarantee complete economic independence of their countries.

The favourable conditions for foreign economic relations which have taken shape under the influence of the socialist countries on international trade contribute to a definite quantitative growth of the exporting branches of the economy but do not by themselves effect qualitative changes in the entire economic structure, without which it is impossible to develop national productive forces and gain economic independence.

It is only a cardinal change of the colonial-communal structure of the economy, the maximum and planned utilisation of

all the internal material and manpower resources that will make it possible to raise the national productivity of labour and on this basis to increase employment and improve the social and material situation of the people considerably. This, however, will be done neither by foreign imperialism nor by African private capital.

For all the variety and specificity of the development of the African countries, particularly in Tropical Africa, they have one feature in common — profound socio-economic backwardness and economic division due to their long-continued colonial domination by the West. The economic structure of the majority of African states, which has taken form as a result of this domination, determines their unequal position on the world capitalist market, their dependence on the imperialist monopolies, economic separatism, the poorly developed social division of labour, the small capacity of the home market, and the vast unemployment of the population with all its corollaries. The fact that the African continent lags far behind Asia and Latin America in development rates speaks for itself.

The economy of Africa, Tropical Africa in the first place, was and remains the most backward in the capitalist world. It makes the basis for the most undeveloped social and class relations.

The economy of Africa continues to develop under its own momentum as the raw materials base of the imperialist powers. Its industrial production in per capita terms is equivalent to one-thirtieth of that of the developed capitalist states, and this gap tends to widen rather than narrow down in time. Simultaneously, the exporting branches of agriculture are growing at a faster rate than internal consumer production. As a result, in the first half of the 1960s food production increased by an annual average of 1.9 per cent, whereas the natural population increase was 2.5 per cent.

In the field of social development some independent African countries have made appreciable progress, whereas in the economic field they are practically in the take-off stage of a difficult and long struggle for economic independence. The growth of their productive forces is inhibited by their economic structure formed as a result of colonial domination and the prevalence of the subsistence economy, but primarily by the fact that they pay for what they buy more than they get for what they sell. Consequently, they are still tributaries to the imperialist super-monopolies.

The economic system of modern Africa is characteristically multistructural, which has left an imprint on the class structure of society as well. For instance, the family-tribal and patriarchal-feudal relations exist in the greater part of the continent, although the subsistence economy based on communal property is being relatively quickly destroyed by the market relations developing in town and country. In addition, the African countries have small-commodity, private capitalist and state capitalist structures. Enterprises belonging not to private foreign monopoly capital but to the state sector have a considerable part to play in the African economy, in such countries as Libya, Algeria, Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, the United Republic of Tanzania, and some other countries which have not only anti-imperialist but also certain anti-capitalist features and tendencies.

The present stage of the national liberation movement in Africa is characterised by an accelerated polarisation of the class and political forces. The socio-class structure of the African society is extremely complex and varied.

Since foreign capital has long monopolised the main sources of accumulation, the big and even the middle local bourgeoisie in many African countries is very weak. On the economic plane the national bourgeoisie can so far play only an auxiliary or an intermediary role. Local businessmen have no adequate capital and requisite experience, as a rule, and are incapable of handling the tasks of economic development on a nationwide scale. To cope with these tasks the African countries seek to set up a state sector and attract foreign capital. At the same time, it is a matter of first priority for them to implement correct government regulation of the economy and a thoroughly planned national economic policy. Incidentally, such regulation by no means requires an obligatory and immediate removal of private capital, either local or foreign. It only implies the institution of effective state control over private enterprise and a gradual curtailment and later closure of the colonialist and neocolonialist sources of accumulation, which precisely reflect the economic inequality of countries. Such control in the interest of developing the national productive forces is necessary not only during a transition to non-capitalist development; the young states cannot do without it in general in case they want to exercise their national sovereignty in the economic field.

The petty bourgeoisie has an important role to play in the

social life of the African states. As the main vehicle of nationalism and by virtue of its anti-imperialist sentiments it holds a conspicuous position on the political scene and its slogans enjoy popularity. In Africa, however, just as elsewhere, the petty bourgeoisie is characterised by ideological immaturity and political vacillations.

In many African countries the top echelon of the social structure consists predominantly of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, which is closely linked with the West and does not contemplate any sweeping reforms to improve the life of the people. The foundation of this social structure consists of the peasantry, the relatively small working class and the vast mass of urban semiproletarians, a specific social stratum characteristic of the former colonies. The rapid growth of the urban population (up to 10 per cent a year), which is many times greater than the actual demand for manpower, aggravates the political instability.

The position of the African working class is quite specific. It is numerically small. The mining and manufacturing industries employ roughly 3 million persons. More than one half of the urban workers are employed in the services and one-third in small semiindustrial enterprises. The proportion of permanent skilled industrial workers is small. They are employed mostly in large enterprises owned by foreign capital.

The young working class of the majority of Tropical African countries has not yet realised its historic role in the liberation movement or become a "class for itself". Despite the relatively small size of the African proletariat, however, it has an appreciably growing influence on the political development of different countries on the continent. The working class has come to advance political demands along with economic ones more often. It is gradually gaining prestige among wide sections of the people—the urban poor, handicraftsmen and small traders. The rural youth gravitate towards it also.

The peasants, which make up the bulk of the population, are greatly influenced by the tribal system, the African commune. Based on the indivisible, common property in land, it binds the peasants with a multitude of trammels, backward customs and prejudices. The patriarchal-communal relations, if they are not transformed into cooperative-collectivist relations or regulated by the state in the direction of social progress, may and do retard the transformation of the subsistence economy

into commodity production, generate backwardness and self-containment of the entire tenor of rural life.

In the last few years there has been a fairly rapid process of disintegration of the family-tribal, farmstead-hereditary and neighbourhood commune: a growing number of members, especially young people, break with it and leave for towns in search of jobs in extractive and manufacturing industries. Many peasants set up market-oriented farms. The governments of some African countries attempt to interfere in the communal relations and to "up-date" the system of landownership and land tenure. As demonstrated by experience, however, reliance on the traditional African commune, which is already in a stage of fairly far-advanced disintegration, in an effort to make it the basis for a new social structure, does not always yield positive results.

The main content of social life in Tropical Africa today is the struggle between different classes and social groups, some of which are still in a formative stage. However thickly veiled outwardly, this class struggle is developing mostly over the issue of the ways of strengthening the foundations of the national state and the prospects for its development. The gradual transformation of the tribal system into national communities, which is in evidence, is of immense importance. As is well known from history, this process has invariably run a slow and extremely painful course. What is more, in Africa it is taking place after a great historical delay and is aggravated by an active intervention of reactionary and imperialist forces.

Another of Tropical Africa's specific conditions is that the socio-class and political structure providing direct support for state authority has not yet attained maturity in all of the newly-independent states. For the time being, there are no relatively strong common national, socio-economic and production internal connections, a common national language and literature are often absent, and the language of the former metropolitan country often serves as a means of communication between different ethnic groups. All this complicates the formation of a single national-state and socio-economic organism, largely explains why in Africa's political life one observes almost everywhere the extreme instability of existing regimes and outbreaks of tribal and national feuds, and why the army so readily and often intrudes upon the sphere of government affairs in pursuance of goals which are far from always democratic and progressive.

The political instability, frequent coups and tribal strife leave a specific imprint on the situation in Africa. At times they create favourable opportunities for the imperialists to export counter-revolution covertly or overtly (armed intervention, conspiracies, terrorism), to set up subservient neocolonialist regimes or at least to plant in the government apparatus stooges of the neocolonialist circles bred and trained by former colonialists.

* * *

A theoretical and political analysis of the process of liberation of the African peoples which has been especially intensive since the early sixties suggests at least one important conclusion. The process of struggle for self-determination and the formation of an independent national state in Africa was much faster than the process of combination of all the main objective attributes of a nation, above all its characteristic national-bourgeois economy, which markedly differed from what had been experienced by Europe, North America and even Asia and Latin America.

The anti-imperialist struggle for the national self-determination of the African peoples was waged in the conditions of a pre-capitalist and largely a pre-feudal social structure thinly veiled in bourgeois relations developed mostly in the fields of commodity and money circulation. Imperialism was opposed by peoples most of whom were still living under a tribal system. If such actions of the African peoples had taken place in the 19th century, when the continent had already been carved up by the European colonial powers, they would have been brutally suppressed. Suffice it to recall the revolts of the Zulus, the Matabeles and the Mashonas, and other peoples. Nothing of the kind could have happened after the Second World War and the formation of the world socialist system. Imperialism was forced to take up a defensive posture, and the progressive sections of the African peoples and the African national-revolutionaries took advantage of that. Without waiting for a bourgeois nation to take shape they took the reins of power in the conditions of the tribal system still prevalent.

This gave the African peoples and their leaders an opportunity to choose their own way of socio-economic development and form a nation on a non-capitalist basis. It was up to the leaders and political groups to decide on this matter. Many of them took the path of establishing a national state, seeking to

free themselves from capitalism as a social system, while others unfortunately took the capitalist path paved by the former colonialists. This path, however, leads to a new variety of foreign domination — neocolonialism.

In a large number of African countries the pro-imperialist forces often turned out to be more consolidated than those coming out for genuine national independence and social progress. And small wonder, since the former have power and long-standing ties with the colonialists going back to the time of their direct political rule. In the majority of African countries the government machinery was not seriously purged and reorganised after the abolition of the colonial administration. When the imperialists were forced to grant political independence to their African colonies they, as a rule, left the administrative apparatus, which had been formed during their domination, intact.

It is not accidental, therefore, that in many African countries quite a few statesmen and politicians, who are placemen of the old and particularly of the new colonialists, have remained to this day. To their mind, the revolution ended as soon as they found themselves in power and the ways to personal enrichment opened before them.

All this sheds light on the nature of coups in a number of African countries. Some of them were motivated by a desire to preserve the privileges of the foreign monopolies, as well as the local exploiter groups accreted with foreign capital, and to safeguard the interests of the bureaucratic and military bourgeoisie infected with a lust of accumulation, enrichment and personal gain. International imperialism stops at nothing to reduce the independence of African countries to mere formality.

It is a historical reality that at the present stage no class in the majority of African countries is capable of spearheading a massive effort to transform the fabric of society. The weak African capitalism functioning mostly in the primitive forms of commercial and usurious capital is not in a position to accomplish this. As evidenced by experience, this task can be fulfilled only by an alliance of all genuinely anti-imperialist, progressive forces capable of setting up a national-democratic state and guiding the country along a path of independence and social progress.

As a result of the successes scored in the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution, which has abolished the direct

political domination of imperialism in the greater part of the continent, favourable conditions have been created in Africa for a number of countries to switch over to non-capitalist development and implement sweeping socio-economic changes. The logic of revolutionary struggle in the interests of the people, the inability of the local bourgeoisie to cope with the cardinal problems of development lead many African statesmen, public and political leaders to conclude that Africa will be able to overcome its difficulties only by a socialist remaking of its social life and economy. Among the African peoples capitalism has long and quite reasonably been associated with the hateful colonialism. Such progressive tendencies serve as a major prerequisite for the independent countries of the continent to draw closer to world socialism and the international working-class movement.

The sweeping socio-economic reforms being implemented by the national-revolutionary, democratic forces, which are in power in such African countries as Tanzania, the People's Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Benin, Ethiopia and others, may advance them to a frontier beyond which socialist horizons open. In the present epoch the objective necessity for the liberated African countries to change over to socialism can prevail under certain conditions and bring success. This is a cause for the peoples themselves, for the progressive socialist and anti-imperialist forces in each country to decide. Its success depends on their ability to struggle exactly for this path of development. Enjoying political and economic support from world socialism and taking advantage of the contradictions between the imperialist powers, the African states in which the national-democratic regimes rely on the masses can advance successfully along a non-capitalist path.

The masses repose in socialism their hopes for an early abolition of poverty and backwardness. Not only the young working class of Africa but also the wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie and the toiling peasantry, which constitute the massive basis for African revolution, are interested in a radical transformation of the African society on socialist principles.

The reforms carried out in the countries pursuing a non-capitalist path have already produced a favourable impact on the social situation of the people who have been given an opportunity to enjoy the first fruits of education, labour legislation and public health. The successes of these countries would have

indisputably been even more substantial if it were not for the resistance of domestic reaction, and the intrigues of the imperialist forces which stop at nothing in an effort to undermine the economy and discredit the progressive regimes in every way.

Difficulties connected with subjective factors are also in evidence. They are caused by the unavailability of adequate experience in statesmanship to many national-democratic leaders, as well as by their errors manifest in their predilection for a rule by administrative decree and in their certain isolation from the masses and their daily interests. Not infrequently such political and government leaders are oblivious of the need to conduct ideological, educational and explanatory work in the midst of the masses, confine themselves to verbal declarations and fail to live up to their promises, which naturally causes disillusionment among the people. Domestic reaction and imperialism are quick to turn these failings to their advantage.

As demonstrated by experience, for success in the struggle against the intrigues of domestic and foreign reaction the national democrats should be able to mobilise the masses to the building of a new society, to explain to them the essence of the national goals and tasks, to enhance their role in the government of the country and to give them material incentives to better work performance. It is imperative to strengthen the unity of all progressive forces for this purpose. It is also necessary to form a progressive party capable of leading the masses, of educating them politically and ideologically for an effective rebuff to imperialism and its local minions. Another urgent problem is a gradual reorganisation of the old government apparatus and, under definite conditions, a determined effort to break it up and purge it from dangerous corrupt elements, and to convert the army into a dependable stronghold of the national-democratic regime.

The need for cooperation and cohesion of all revolutionary forces in the name of a radiant future for the peoples of the continent is the guiding principle for the African Marxists-Leninists, whose ranks are widening and growing stronger. The Communists do not stand aloof from the progressive movements in modern Africa. They are closely following African social thought and everything new that the activity of the national-democratic forces introduces into the forms and methods of social reconstruction in conformity with the specific conditions of each African country. The successes of the

revolutionary democrats are largely dependent on how firmly and confidently they rely on the growing working class and other progressive sections of the working people.

A favourable situation is developing in Africa for close collaboration of the Communists and the revolutionary democrats in the struggle against imperialism, for socio-economic reforms and an improvement in the living conditions of the masses. In our day only hopeless dogmatists and sectarians can insist on the so-called "revolutionary intransigence" to the non-proletarian national-democratic forces. The Communists are active in disseminating the ideas of scientific socialism in Africa and combining it with the working-class movement, helping the ideological education of national-revolutionaries from among the intelligentsia and the peasantry, and primarily from the ranks of the organised working-class movement. At the same time, they collaborate with the vanguard socialist-oriented parties. They deem it their duty to levy criticism on the right wing of the national parties gravitating to capitalism.

The Communists also support measures directed to strengthening national independence and oppose with determination everything that may weaken the national regimes confronted by foreign and domestic reaction. By their ideological and organising work the Communists facilitate the adoption of the ideology of scientific socialism by the progressive sections of the working class, the peasants and the intelligentsia of the African countries. By applying creatively in conformity with the principles of scientific socialism the new forms of struggle and the slogans advanced by the movement for the national and social liberation of the African peoples, the Communists make a substantial contribution to the cause of revolutionary remaking of the continent.

The Struggle Against Colonialism and Racism

The tide of the national liberation movement which swept Africa in the postwar period temporarily stopped on the threshold of the countries where the colonialists and racists had entrenched themselves especially firmly. The ruling quarters of the Republic of South Africa, Salazar's Portugal and Southern Rhodesia took every measure to block the road to eradicating the last strongpoints of colonialism and racism in Africa. Without confining themselves to unilateral measures, they knocked together a covert military-political alliance in pursuit of the goal of preserving the racist and colonialist regimes and preventing new countries from taking the road of social progress, of building up in southern Africa a military-industrial base of imperialism, a bridgehead for a counter-offensive against the independent states of the continent. The imperialists are staking primarily on the preservation and consolidation of the last strongholds of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. The South African bloc of colonialists and racists set up for suppressing by force of arms the liberation struggle of the indigenous population of this area was directed against all African countries and threatened their independence and sovereignty.

The struggle against colonialism and neocolonialism, as well as against racism, is the linchpin of modern Africa's political life and the main direction of the activities of the anti-imperialist states in the Organisation of African Unity. The grave danger of counter-attacks of imperialism in Africa

had confronted its liberation movement with an all-important problem of strengthening the unity of the democratic forces for a rebuff to the colonialists and for rendering effective assistance to the peoples which are still waging a difficult fight for their national self-determination, at times against overwhelming odds. Effective support for these peoples is one of the factors uniting the independent African countries in their anti-imperialist struggle and laying the groundwork for a militant unity of the African revolutionary movement with the socialist world, with all revolutionary and democratic forces.

The stepped up activity of the colonialist and racist regimes in southern Africa, their unending intrigues against the movement for the freedom and independence of the African peoples are yet another evidence of the correctness of the conclusion made in the final document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties to the effect that "of great importance for the future of Africa and the cause of peace is the liberation of southern Africa, one of the last areas of colonial domination".*

At the same time, to overthrow the racist-colonialist regimes in southern Africa is part of the struggle of the world's progressive forces against racism, this monstrous heritage of the epoch of colonialism, imperialism, social exploitation and oppression of small and socially and economically backward peoples.

Racism is guilty of many an atrocious crime against humanity. The extermination of whole peoples, the slave trade and the merciless colonial oppression of the aboriginal inhabitants of Asia, Africa and Latin America—all these and many other heinous crimes which capitalism has on its conscience were justified by all sorts of racist fabrications. Imperialism readily resorts to various "theories" intended to justify the conception of "superior" and "inferior" races.

The origins of racism go back in time to the slave trade and the colonial wars and are thus directly linked with the evolution of the capitalist mode of production. In the imperialist era racism assumed an especially cynical character as a tool in the hands of the exploiter classes by which they try to preserve their positions of privilege. Quite indicative is the fact

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 27.

that racism comes to full bloom where monopoly capital establishes the most reactionary forms of its domination—open dictatorship and fascism.

In our day the ruling quarters of the racist-colonialist regimes in southern Africa alone venture openly to declare their commitment to racism, which has been repeatedly denounced at the United Nations and other international forums. The overwhelming majority of other imperialist states have officially condemned racial discrimination. Legislation against racial discrimination, however, is ineffective since the socio-economic and political conditions generating racist conceptions and views remain unchanged in these countries.

The most striking example of this is the situation in the United States, which likes to call itself "the freest country in the world". The century which has elapsed since the abolition of slavery has brought the 25 million American Blacks neither equality nor genuine freedom. Racism is linked organically with the deepest foundations of the US social system to this day.

In the southern part of the African continent a solid conglomeration of colonial territories and racist states, in which the indigenous population was oppressed, had existed until some time ago. The downfall of the Portuguese colonial empire caused the collapse of this "southern stronghold" of African reaction.

The racist reign of terror is continuing in its most violent forms in the RSA. In the hands of the ruling classes of the South African society racism is a weapon called upon to keep the non-European population in colonial bondage, to preserve a situation in which 3.7 million Europeans could maintain a high standard of life by a ruthless exploitation of the 16 million non-European population.

The policy pursued by the South African racists is based on the doctrine of apartheid, which implies a segregated existence and development of different races and national groups living in the RSA. The nationalist leaders are insistently brainwashing the population of European descent with the idea that the whites in South Africa are the "master race" whereas Africans are alleged to be "an inferior race".

Any protest against the existing situation, and any attempt on the part of South African freedom champions to struggle for the restoration of their flouted human dignity entail reprisals. The political parties and organisations of the indigenous

population have been disbanded, the organs of the press which raised their voice in defence of the rights of the Africans have been banned. Tens of thousands of progressive-minded South Africans have been thrown into jails and concentration camps. The indigenous population is deprived of the vote in the elections to Parliament, provincial councils and other government bodies of the country.

In 1959 the RSA Parliament adopted the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act. The Africans were promised broad autonomy in the areas of Bantu settlement—Bantustans. The racist rulers of the RSA hypocritically declare that the establishment of the Bantustans is a sign of the “wind of change” that has swept Africa during the last 10 to 15 years. Actually, however, Bantu “self-government” is nothing but a mockery of the freedom aspirations of the African population. This “self-government” is purely fictitious. The racists deny 13 million Africans the right of citizenship in the whole of the RSA territory, restricting their domicile to the limits of the Bantustans in the areas of the present-day reservations which account for only one-eighth of the country’s territory, with the rest of the territory occupied by the 6 million of the RSA population. The situation of the indigenous inhabitants herded in the reservations—arid lands of little agricultural value—is continually going from bad to worse and becoming intolerable. The white minority seeks to preserve its rule by a cruel reign of terror. A special Bureau of State Security (BOSS), subordinated directly to the Prime Minister and accountable neither to Parliament nor to the judiciary agencies, has been set up to direct operations against the liberation movement. Repression against the freedom champions is assuming an ever wider scale. The RSA leads the world for the number of death verdicts. The cruelty of the RSA’s racist punitive machinery reached an apogee on March 21, 1960, in the bloody massacre of peaceful demonstrations of the African population in the settlements of Sharpeville and Lang, in protest against the enforcement of a new law on passes for Africans which sharply restricted their freedom of movement already curtailed as it was. Scores of dead and about 200 wounded was the result of this slaughter. The echo of the Sharpeville shootings rang out throughout the world. It attracted attention to the violence of racism in the RSA and the rightlessness of its non-European population. At the appeal of the UN General Assembly the day of the Sharpeville massacre—

March 21 — began to be commemorated each year as the day of struggle against racial discrimination throughout the world.

Their “brethren in spirit” in Rhodesia are following in the footsteps of the racists of the Republic of South Africa. In November 1965 the racist government of Ian Smith, which expresses the interests of 250,000 European colonists, proclaimed Rhodesia “an independent state”. This action undertaken by the Rhodesian racists with the direct connivance of Great Britain denied, in effect, the 5 million indigenous inhabitants participation in the administration of the country and doomed them to a vegetative existence in conditions of poverty and humiliation.

Just as in the RSA, the racist Smith regime in Rhodesia does not scruple to use the foulest means to perpetuate the supremacy of the white minority over the African majority. Taking advantage of the connivance of the imperialist powers, Britain first and foremost, in June 1969 the racists held a so-called referendum to secure approval of the proposal for proclaiming Rhodesia an independent republic. In fact, it was a question of setting up another racist state modelled on the RSA, where apartheid makes the foundation of the entire life of society. The freedom fighters of Zimbabwe are waging an armed struggle for their rights.

* * *

The overthrow of fascism in Portugal and the beginning of decolonisation of Angola and Mozambique seriously changed the situation in southern Africa. The fundamental element in the RSA’s African policy—the line towards preserving the vast southern region under the direct control of the colonialists and racists—has suffered a fiasco. The strategic position of the apartheid regime has markedly deteriorated.

In spite of the changed situation, the immediate goal of the Vorster government in Africa remained the same. It consisted in legalising the regime and isolating the South African liberation movement from the independent states of the continent. The struggle to attain this goal claimed more flexibility and concessions from the RSA. One of them was its consent to recognise the African governments in the former Portuguese colonies and even collaborate with them on condition that they are stable and do not support the South African “terrorists”. Favourable changes were promised in the RSA and

Namibia. The Vorster government hinted that it would bring pressure to bear on Smith for a "just" settlement of the Rhodesian problem.

As for the promises concerning the RSA and Namibia, the RSA initiatives contained nothing new from the start. It was a question, in effect, of a certain acceleration in the programme of Bantustanisation, which the regime depicted as a means of solving the national question and guaranteeing the right to self-determination to the Africans of the RSA and Namibia. In Rhodesia the racists seemed at first to be prepared to go further than that. In the course of secret talks between Pretoria and Lusaka agreement was reached on facilitating the release of political prisoners, lifting the ban on political parties, widening the rights of the Africans, etc.

This was attributable to several causes. The international positions of the racist regime were quite weak: no country in the world had granted it formal recognition. With the beginning of the decolonisation of the Portuguese colonies Rhodesia had found itself exposed on the flanks, its importance for the RSA as a buffer state had declined and its strategic vulnerability had increased. Britain's Labour government took more vigorous steps to resolve the Rhodesian crisis than the Conservatives. The majority of African states, particularly Zambia, whose position had a great bearing on the policy of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) towards the RSA, insisted on the settlement of precisely this problem as a matter of first priority. Finally, Pretoria was less concerned with the interests of Salisbury than with its own. Hence the RSA and its Western allies took a decision to try and appease independent Africa primarily at the expense of the Rhodesian racists.

The RSA hoped to gain time by means of such concessions, intending for a start to prevent an escalation of confrontation between the OAU and the racist South, and to interfere with the African states taking advantage of the favourable situation to step up pressure on the regimes and increase support for the liberation movements. The racists concentrated on an effort to thwart the freedom fighters' armed struggle, and declared the need for a peaceful settlement of disputes between the "white" and "black" Africa and a relaxation of tensions in the south of the continent. Hence the racists' main counter-proposal was for a "ceasefire", which practically meant a demand for the guerillas' withdrawal to their mustering-up areas.

The RSA and its imperialist patrons sought to attain their goals by a recourse to the time-tested tactics of splitting the ranks of the Organisation of African Unity. This time, along with such traditional advocates of a "dialogue" as the Ivory Coast, they largely succeeded in securing support for their plans from Zambia. Among the circumstances which induced Zambia to give in on this issue one may refer to its weariness from confrontation, its growing economic difficulties and political instability, and the pressure from the imperialist powers accompanied by promises of support in exchange for a reversal of its policy. Another factor was indisputably the fear of Zambia's ruling circles lest the left forces consolidate their positions in the liberation movements and the prestige of socialism, the countries of the socialist community increase along with the aggravation of the conflict over the South. The activities of Zambia's ruling circles were supported by Tanzania and a few other countries. The situation which has developed seems paradoxical. The victory over the Portuguese colonialists has not on the face of it stimulated the anti-imperialist tendencies within the OAU but has entailed, as it were, a shift to the right in its political orientation. This gave birth to the OAU's new strategy.

The new strategy was formulated in the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa and a number of other resolutions adopted by the Liberation Committee in January, and the 9th Extraordinary Session of the OAU Council of Ministers in April 1975. The Kampala Summit Meeting of the African Heads of State and Government approved these documents.

As a result of pressure from the left, in which Algeria was particularly active, as well as of the political circumspection of Zambia and Tanzania, the declaration looks almost impeccable outwardly. It describes Vorster's initiatives as new manoeuvres for the purpose of reducing if not neutralising the results of the revolutionary changes in the region. Having reaffirmed without reservations the OAU's commitment to the cause of complete liberation of the continent, the declaration proclaims the RSA Enemy No.1 of Africa. The African states reject apartheid and all its manifestations, including the so-called independent homelands (Bantustans), and appeal for a stepped up economic, political and cultural boycott of the RSA.

The OAU decision to regard the liberation of Rhodesia

and Namibia as a task of first priority also appears logical. They are considered to be the weakest links in the system of racist domination. The OAU demands independence for Rhodesia "on the basis of majority rule", the RSA's withdrawal from Namibia and the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of this country, and recognises SWAPO as a lawful representative of the Namibian people.

Nevertheless, according to a unanimous assessment of the national liberation movements, the changeover of the OAU to a new strategy was a step backward.

In 1969 the so-called Lusaka Manifesto for the first time in the OAU's history allowed for the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the problem of the South provided the regimes agree to recognise the right of the enslaved peoples to equality and self-determination, and to open talks with leaders of the liberation movements concerned on translating this right into reality. In the event of fulfilling the OAU conditions by the regimes, the African states assumed a commitment to persuade the patriotic forces to abstain from demands for an immediate liberation and armed struggle and agree to a gradual peaceful takeover of government. The OAU warned at the same time that in case of a refusal to accept the manifesto as the basis for a settlement the armed struggle would be stepped up.

After the racist regimes had rejected the Lusaka Manifesto the emphasis was laid on an intensification of the armed struggle (Mogadishu Declaration of 1971). Now the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration again put in the foreground the "quests of opportunities for a peaceful change" although it recommended combining them with full preparedness for an intensified armed struggle. It meant Rhodesia in the first place, regarding which the declaration proceeded from the possibility of winning independence by peaceful means, in particular by means of a constitutional conference, with the liberation forces and the Smith regime taking part. The Dar-es-Salaam Declaration thereby fell back from the Lusaka Manifesto by sanctioning "a peaceful settlement" without a preliminary recognition by the Rhodesian regime of the right of the Zimbabwe peoples to self-determination.

In itself the desire of independent Africa to achieve its goals without bloodshed, avoiding unnecessary sacrifices and suffering, did and does deserve full support. At the same time, nobody expected the racists to act on the decolonisation issues

in the same way as the new authorities in Lisbon. In contrast to Portugal the character of the government regimes in the RSA and Rhodesia remained unchanged. Their situation had deteriorated but not to a point of surrender. To achieve practical results it seemed necessary for Africa to support its diplomatic and political steps with strong military pressure. This, however, failed to occur.

Once they had sensed the lack of determination in the Organisation of African Unity, the racists immediately took a harder line on the Rhodesian problem. Only a small part of the political prisoners were released, the state of emergency was not lifted, the activities of the liberation organisations were obstructed in various ways, and the calling of a constitutional conference was delayed under various pretexts.

As a result of the racists' manoeuvres the positions of the liberation movement on the eve of the constitutional conference deteriorated on the whole. This was aggravated by the contradictions between the parties which had united under the aegis of the African National Council in December 1974. Conciliatory elements in the African population, particularly among the intellectuals, became more active. For his part, Smith behaved defiantly, declaring publicly that majority rule was out of the question in the lifetime of the present generation.

The declaration contains no specific proposals for the mechanism of a peaceful takeover of power in Namibia. "If South Africa has no intention to end its illegal occupation of Namibia," it says, "the OAU should help the national liberation movement in Namibia, SWAPO, and intensify the armed struggle."

The RSA's actions demonstrate clearly the racists' unwillingness to withdraw from Namibia. The RSA government's position explained to Kurt Waldheim and his special envoy in the course of the consultations in 1972 and 1973 sanctioned by the Security Council has not changed. The racists continue to deny recognition to SWAPO as the sole lawful representative of the Namibian people, are stepping up reprisals against the freedom champions and going ahead with the policy of Bantustanisation.

In January 1975 a repeated election to the puppet Parliament of Ovamboland was held. The first attempt to organise such an election in August 1973 failed ignominiously: 97.5 per cent of the electorate responded to SWAPO's appeal for its boycott.

This time the racists, resorting to threats and deception, succeeded in forcing slightly over half of the voters to go to the polls.

As is known, by a decision of the United Nations, South West Africa (Namibia) is to be granted independence. This decision is opposed by the RSA and its fulfilment is systematically obstructed. After the rigged elections in the Ovambo zone the racist regime stubbornly continues its manoeuvres with the object of breaking up Namibia into Bantustans. As a result of the reign of terror and oppression on the part of the racist regime, there is a massive exodus of the country's inhabitants to Zambia, which aggravates the situation of the refugees grave as it is. These refugees, mostly members of SWAPO, describe the cruel and humiliating treatment of the indigenous population by the racist regime. Flogging of those who call for the freedom and unity of Namibia, particularly members of SWAPO, has become a matter of routine. Arrests and arbitrary detention are a common thing.

The deadline set by the Security Council for the withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia was May 30, 1973. Pretoria ignored this demand. In the prevailing situation the SWAPO leadership deems it necessary to step up armed actions. In this matter the party is coming up against an overt and covert opposition from some leaders in Zambia's ruling circles.

The "new strategy" is causing the greatest damage to the liberation movement in the Republic of South Africa. Although the Dar-es-Salaam Declaration not only appeals for a boycott of the RSA but also comes out in "support of the struggle of the South African liberation movements in whatever form", the anti-RSA orientation of the policies of a number of neighbouring countries has practically lessened.

While giving lip service to a peaceful settlement, the RSA government has boosted its preparations for war. The country's military budget for 1973/74 was increased by 480 million rands, and in 1974/75 by another 700 million. The arms appropriations were raised simultaneously from 117 to 311 million rands. "Detente" did not stop Vorster from intervention in the Angolan events, where the RSA backed up the FNLA and UNITA.

As for the situation in the RSA itself, signs of another upsurge in the popular movement have been in evidence here during the last few years. The strike movement continues

unabated. In 1972 and 1973 the country was swept by a wave of strikes involving up to 200,000 people. The resistance of the non-white groups to the resettlement programmes has increased. There is discontent among the peasants, and the young people, and a growing tendency towards unity between the coloured and the Indian population. At the same time, the contradictions within the ruling class itself have exacerbated, which is evidenced, in particular, by the division within the opposition United Party.

It has evidently been realised in Pretoria that the attempts to deal with the situation exclusively by means of a reign of terror will not yield the desired result this time. Therefore, while continuing the reprisals against the freedom champions, the regime has undertaken certain "reforms". The wages have been slightly raised, concessions were made in the questions concerning the right of the African workers to organisations and to strikes, the law on criminal prosecution of Africans quitting their jobs was abrogated and the system of passes mitigated. The regime concentrated its efforts on accelerated Bantustanisation. In 1976 "independence" was granted to Transkei.

* * *

Racism was also an inalienable attribute of the policy pursued by fascist Portugal in its colonies — Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. Here it took somewhat different forms. While the RSA openly proclaimed the doctrine of apartheid, racial segregation, i.e. separate existence of different racial and ethnic groups, the Portuguese colonialists advocated "assimilation" of Africans. In an effort to deceive world opinion they declared their colonies "overseas provinces" and formally granted Portuguese citizenship to all indigenous inhabitants, but the change in name did not change the colonialist essence of their policy. The indigenous inhabitants were prevented from participating in socio-political life by insurmountable barriers. For instance, the right to vote and to election was granted only to "assimilated" Africans meeting a number of qualifications: they have to speak and write in Portuguese, to adhere to the Christian faith, to have permanent income sufficient to maintain one's family, to pay regular taxes, not to evade conscription and lead a "Portuguese way of life".

These requirements were a mockery of common sense, the natural rights and aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants, and their national dignity. The number of "assimilated" persons in Angola was only about 1 per cent of the total number of Africans, and less than 0.5 per cent in Mozambique.

Why did Portuguese colonialism turn out to be more long-lived than its stronger British, French, Belgian and other accomplices in plundering the peoples of the colonies? An explanation of this fact should be sought in the socio-economic system of Portugal, its relations with the biggest imperialist powers.

The fascist regime which reigned supreme in this country for almost half a century was the basis for the most barbaric colonialism, a tool for oppressing the Portuguese people, of suppressing its rights and interests. Thirty-five per cent of the population of Portugal was illiterate, the press and all mass media were subjected to severe censorship, and only 15 per cent of the country's population enjoyed the suffrage rights. All the other adult population, including women, lacked, as the Portuguese authorities alleged, "adequate civic maturity". This level of "democracy" in Portugal was concurrent with an extremely backward structure of the economy entirely dependent on foreign capital.

Prime Minister Dr. Marcelo Caetano who headed the Portuguese government since September 26, 1968 at first stinted no promises to "liberalise" the regime. Contrary to his "liberal" promises, however, his government continued the policy of the former dictator Salazar.

The policy of enslaving the colonies did not change either. If Salazar had set himself the task of "enduring" the war against the peoples of the colonies, Caetano laid claim to winning it.

The successes of the African patriotic insurgent organisations compelled the Portuguese colonialists to resort to new tactics intended to undermine the national liberation movement from within. One example of the tactical manoeuvres of imperialism was the intention of the Portuguese government to grant Angola and Mozambique a measure of autonomy (with the metropolitan country retaining decision-making powers in the key fields of defence, foreign affairs, economics and foreign trade).

The demagogic manoeuvres of the Portuguese ruling quarters were intended to cultivate among the African population

collaborationist elements ready to make a deal with the Portuguese colonialists. The granting of limited autonomy to the "overseas provinces" in the politico-legal aspect looked as an attempt at "Africanisation" which fascist Portugal sought to implement in its colonial policy after the fashion of the US policy of "Vietnamisation". This "Africanisation" assumed definite forms in the military field. A military training centre for Africans was set up in Mozambique. The local residents trained there were enlisted in the Portuguese colonial army and engaged to form special task units for anti-guerilla warfare. The inhabitants of "local population centres" set up around economically important areas were issued with arms "for self-defence" in the event of a guerilla attack. This served the same object of "making Africans fight Africans". All these manoeuvres intended to set African civilians on the national liberation armies or to isolate them from the popular masses interfered with the armed struggle of the freedom fighters and created additional difficulties for the enlistment of new members in the insurgent army.

Along with the use of neocolonialist methods and attempts to split the local population the Portuguese colonialists were building up their military power and sought to step up operations against the national liberation forces.

Portugal kept a large army under arms and spent on its upkeep and the war in Africa sums which were enormous for such a small and backward country. According to the London International Institute for Strategic Studies, in 1969 Portugal kept 122,000 officers and men in its African territories (55,000 in Angola, 40,000 in Mozambique and 27,000 in Guinea). Portugal's military spending in 1969 was 321 million dollars. This was a 630 per cent increase over 1949. By the end of the colonial period the strength of the Portuguese forces in Africa had reached 170,000.

The intensified operations of the Portuguese authorities in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau met with the growing resistance of the national liberation forces. Whereas on the moral-political plane the national liberation forces possessed considerable reserves and advantages both inside the country and on the international scene, in the military field the insurgent movement came up against many difficulties in organising armed struggle.

Taking advantage of these difficulties, which are encountered by the national liberation movement, imperialist propa-

ganda went out of its way to "convince" the Africans of the "futility" of their struggle, to stir defeatist sentiments among them and to bribe some bourgeois elements prone to make a deal with imperialism.

The fanatical urge of the Portuguese ruling circles now overthrown by the democratic revolution to hold their African colonies was motivated by their fear of losing a source of enrichment of exceptional importance to the ruling classes of fascist Portugal, which brought them an annual income of over 250 million dollars.

An important factor which prolonged the life of Portuguese colonialism was the coordination of its efforts with the actions of the South African racists. Both sides had long recognised the community of their destinies and interests and backward Portugal received all-round assistance from the rulers of the RSA and Southern Rhodesia, who felt themselves in a safer position and for whom the Portuguese colonies were in turn a territorial obstacle to the liberation movement which had spread throughout the continent.

The bloc of fascist Portugal and the South African racists operated in an extremely active and well-coordinated way. In the RSA, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies aided by other imperialist powers the armed forces were being built up, though they were already much larger than the armies of the majority of the independent countries of Tropical Africa put together. Special attention was given to training units for anti-guerilla warfare. The RSA formed "invasion forces" — well-trained units equipped with modern weapons, which could be quickly moved to any district both inside the country and abroad.

Facts indicate that the colonialists coordinated their military operations aimed at suppressing the liberation movement. For instance, over 2,000 South African troops took part in fighting the guerilla movement in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and jointly with South Rhodesian troops provoked armed incidents on the Zambian border.

It will be no exaggeration to say that the Portuguese colonies, as well as the oppressed peoples of the RSA, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, would have long won freedom if the imperialist member-countries of NATO had not acted as vehement supporters of colonialism and racism. The biggest multinational monopolies had practically unlimited opportunities for their activities in the Portuguese colonies. This is

why for their part they spared no funds or effort to support the rule of the colonialists.

Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau in the politico-economic sense might be called colonies of international monopoly capital, colonies of the bloc of the member-states of NATO. Foreign capital dominated all the key branches of the economy. The diamond fields were controlled by Anglo-Belgian-American capital, the production of iron and manganese by West German and American capital, and the oil-fields by American and Belgian trusts.

The NATO military-political alliance attached great importance in its plans to the strategic position not only of fascist Portugal itself but also its colonies. Under an agreement with the government of fascist Portugal the United States built air bases on the Azores. These bases handle up to 80 per cent of the flights of US military aircraft across the Atlantic. The islands are also used by American nuclear submarines. West Germany also had military training bases in Portugal. In 1967 the Special Command of the NATO Allied Forces in the Iberian Atlantic set up its headquarters in Portugal. Its task was to ensure ocean communications and safeguard the sea approaches to the Mediterranean. In fact all or nearly all of what the Portuguese armed forces had at their disposal, in Africa in particular, had been supplied by Portugal's NATO allies.

On the international scene the imperialist powers more and more frankly resort to open support for the South African reactionary regimes. This is evidenced by the repeated visits of official representatives of the former British Conservative government and emissaries of monopoly capital in Salisbury. The collusion between the British Tories and the Rhodesian racists was directed to legalising the Smith regime and handing over to it "on legal grounds" the power which the regime had usurped in 1965. Simultaneously the collusion between the then ruling circles of Britain and Rhodesia served their common goal of reinforcing racist Rhodesia, which is a stronghold of imperialism fighting the liberation movement of the peoples of southern Africa.

This is attested by the British Conservative government's decision to resume arms supplies to the South African racists. Another evidence is the decision of the US Congress to lift the embargo on chromium imports from Rhodesia. Representatives of the Western powers in the UN agencies sys-

tematically thwart the implementation of effective measures against the colonial-racist regimes and, in particular, a hardening of sanctions against Rhodesia and their extension to the RSA, which is openly violating the ban on trade with Rhodesia.

Relying on all-round support from the imperialist powers the reactionary forces are attempting to extend the economic and political expansion of the RSA both to the South African region and to a number of independent African countries. The West-inspired idea of a "dialogue" with the RSA was proclaimed by President Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast. Although the majority of African countries, as pointed out above, rejected this idea, it was also supported by representatives of Lesotho, Malawi, Madagascar, Gabon and Mauritius. The RSA and Malawi have established diplomatic relations. The idea has not yet petered out, and the "dialogue" is already in progress. Time will show what it will lead to. One thing is clear: the racist regimes will not give up their positions by way of a "dialogue". They will reckon only with real force and the unity of the African peoples and states fighting against racism.

In future, in view of the economic difficulties and the political instability of some African states and the great economic potential of the RSA, one cannot rule out a manifestation of tendencies towards rapprochement with the RSA regime on the part of individual states, which may produce an unfavourable impact on the alignment of forces on the African continent and the development of the national liberation movement in the South African region. The growth of the economic and military ties between the RSA and Israel graphically demonstrates that they are supposed to play a more or less similar role in the African strategy of imperialism, one of undermining the unity of independent Africa.

In spite of definite differences in the policies of the leading imperialist powers in the south of the African continent, all of them operate in the final analysis as conspirators in a reactionary bloc. The multinational monopolies make enormous profits on capital invested in the economy of the RSA, Rhodesia and the former Portuguese colonies. The stability of the racist regimes and the conversion of the former Portuguese colonies into neocolonialist states, obeying the orders of the monopolies, give them the most secure guarantees of waxing fat on the exploitation of the enslaved African peoples.

However, it is not only a question of the RSA and Rhodesia being assigned a highly important role in implementing the far-reaching political plans of imperialism. According to the designs of the imperialist strategists, these countries are called upon not only to step up the rising tide of national liberation revolution in southern Africa, but to become a kind of bridgehead for neocolonisation of the continent. Hence the active economic, political and military support given by the West to the RSA and Rhodesia.

Notwithstanding the cruel tyranny of the colonialists and racists relying on the military and economic power and support of world imperialism, the will of the indigenous population was not subdued, its freedom aspirations only grew as its exploitation and the racist reign of terror were intensified, and its struggle assumed an increasingly determined character.

In contrast to the majority of the now independent African countries where the national liberation revolution was implemented mostly by peaceful means, the national liberation movement in the Portuguese colonies, Rhodesia and the RSA culminated eventually in an open armed uprising against its oppressors.

The armed struggle was started in Angola in 1961, in Portuguese Guinea in 1962, in Mozambique in 1964, in South West Africa in 1966, in Rhodesia in 1967. "The armed struggle which is being waged in this area by the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa is inflicting heavy blows on the coalition of fascist and racist regimes, which are supported by the imperialists, and is opening up prospects for fresh big victories of the African revolution,"* said the final document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

The struggle of the African peoples for their liberation was headed by the national-revolutionary parties: the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) in Angola, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) in Mozambique, the African Party for Independence in Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC) in Guinea-Bissau, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) in Rhodesia, the African National Congress (ANC) in the RSA and the

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 27.

South-West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) in South West Africa.

As regards the class composition of all these parties the ANC alone has a membership consisting mostly of workers and semiproletarian sections of the population. The bulk of the membership of the MPLA, PAIGC, FRELIMO and ZAPU are peasants (about 90 per cent). These parties regard the national petty bourgeoisie as their ally. The working-class stratum within these parties is small; the role of the trade union organisations following them is unimportant. Since the vast majority of the rank-and-file party members are illiterate or uneducated, the policy of these parties is determined by the national-revolutionary intelligentsia, which constitutes the core of their governing bodies.

All these revolutionary-democratic organisations regard the abolition of the colonial and racist regimes, the conquest and consolidation of national independence and the establishment of a democratic state as a task of first priority. As for their long-range goals, they are now being planned in detail with a view to social progress, restructuring the economy, control over foreign capital, developing national industry and agriculture, establishing a state sector in the economy, implementing an agrarian reform, intensive training of research and engineering personnel, raising their own intelligentsia, reorganising the government apparatus, etc.

Of great importance is the programme of the African National Congress—the Freedom Charter—which contains a list of contemplated sweeping socio-economic reforms: the establishment of a democratic multiracial state, nationalisation of mineral wealth, the banks and industrial monopolies, distribution of the land among those who till it, etc.

Many leaders of the national-revolutionary parties of Africa hold political views close to socialism. In the former Portuguese colonies they matured ideologically under the influence of the Portuguese Communist Party, and in the former French colonies, under the influence of the French Communist Party. The ANC leaders are closely collaborating with the South African Communists.

The level of political maturity of the FRELIMO, MPLA, PAIGC, ZAPU and SWAPO is steadily rising. These organisations consistently adhere to anti-imperialist positions, seek to develop cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and denounce the splitting activities in the

national liberation movement. This does not rule out occasional manifestations of Utopian socialism and nationalism among their members.

The imperialist circles, which are keenly interested in fragmenting the forces of the national liberation movement, encourage the formation of groups opposed to the revolutionary parties, give these groups financial aid and plant agents within them.

The liberation movement of the peoples of southern Africa and the former Portuguese colonies gained strength in the face of formidable difficulties. Broad sections of the local population united under the slogan of the struggle for independence. The freedom fighters stubbornly fought Portuguese punitive troops, for the satisfaction of their lawful demands. The liberation movement in the Portuguese colonies, which had grown into a war of national liberation by the mid-sixties, had an important distinctive feature: without waiting for complete liberation from the colonialists the revolutionary forces solved some important tasks of socio-economic development in the areas placed under their control. The revolutionary parties set up a number of institutions of popular government: military, economic and administrative, which directed activities in the liberated areas, organised agricultural production and trade, facilitated the development of public health and education. In this way the foundations of the future state were laid. The leadership of the revolutionary forces paid close attention to social problems, improving the conditions of life of the local population. This testifies to the profoundly national character of the policy they pursued and correct understanding of their tasks and duty to the people.

The leaders of the patriotic organisations repeatedly offered the government of fascist Portugal to settle the problem of granting independence to its colonies through negotiation. The Portuguese fascist government, however, ignored these proposals, thereby assuming full responsibility for the war which was flaming up with growing intensity in these areas.

Defying brazenly the UN decisions and world opinion the Portuguese colonialists were determined to drown the popular struggle in blood.

The agreement concluded by the ANC and ZAPU in the summer of 1967 on joint military operations against the racist regimes of the RSA and Rhodesia was a milestone in the development of the national liberation movement in southern

Africa. Since the autumn of 1967 joint guerilla units of these parties carried out in Rhodesian territory a few daring raids against local security forces and police contingents urgently moved in from the RSA to reinforce them. However, the insurgent liberation movement has not yet assumed a wide scale here.

Without relaxing their efforts to prepare armed resistance to the racist regimes the freedom fighters in the RSA and Rhodesia have actively used other methods of liberation struggle.

The breach in the united front of the colonialists and racists of South Africa at its most vulnerable point—the Portuguese territories—was a historic victory for the democratic forces heralding complete deliverance of the entire African continent from the most cynical forms of racial oppression and imperialist exploitation in the near future.

After the thirteen years of the colonial war it became obvious that fascist Portugal was unable to suppress the armed struggle for national liberation by military means. For all the financial and military aid from the NATO countries, which enabled Portugal to keep in Africa a 170,000-strong army equipped with modern weapons, and despite the internal difficulties in the national liberation movement itself, the national-democratic parties widened and perfected the forms of armed struggle against the enemy and dealt him shattering blows. During their long struggle against the Portuguese colonialists the national-democratic parties formed numerically small but battleworthy armed forces. They expelled the Portuguese from a number of areas in Mozambique and Angola, and the Republic of Guinea-Bissau was proclaimed in Guinea-Bissau in September 1973.

The diverse military aid, political and moral support from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries enabled the freedom fighters of Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique to change over to a fundamentally new stage in their armed struggle—offensive operations in capturing heavily fortified enemy strongholds.

The anti-popular policy of the fascist regime, its military setbacks, the growth of self-awareness in the Portuguese army, its unwillingness to continue the colonial war, the exorbitant military expenditures exhausting the country's economy, inflation, the exodus of skilled manpower abroad, as well as the increased political isolation of Portugal on the

international scene inevitably created a crisis in the country, led to an upsurge of the democratic movement, a growth of the anti-fascist and anti-war sentiments within the army and among the people.

While admitting the exceptional importance of the armed struggle which was waged by the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau for independence, against the Portuguese colonial army and the fascist colonial regime, as well as the influence of this struggle on the situation in the metropolitan country, it should be pointed out, however, that the crisis of fascism in Portugal and its downfall were triggered off by a combination of factors: the stubborn and long-continued struggle of the democratic forces, above all, the Portuguese Communists, the political isolation of Portugal on the international scene, the massive armed national liberation movement, the support and assistance rendered to this movement by all progressive forces and the socialist countries, the Soviet Union first and foremost, Portugal's defeat in its colonial war, the revolt of the democratic elements in the army and the active struggle of the working class under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party of Portugal.

The combination of the democratic revolution in Portugal with an upsurge of the liberation movement in the colonies, the relations of mutual understanding and support between the progressive and democratic forces in the metropolitan country and in the colonies brilliantly bore out Lenin's idea of an alliance between the working class in the developed countries and the exploited masses in the colonial world.

After the overthrow of the fascist regime in Portugal in April 1974 the national liberation struggle in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau entered its final stage. Portugal's democratic forces in the face of active opposition from Spínola and his followers expressed their willingness to begin decolonisation, and Portugal recognised the right to independence of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands.

Pursuing a policy of democratisation of their country, the Armed Forces Movement of Portugal and the Provisional Government appealed to the national liberation movements for a ceasefire and the opening of talks on a peaceful solution to the problem of the colonies.

The process of decolonisation was the most successful and

the speediest in Guinea-Bissau. Portugal recognised the Republic of Guinea-Bissau as a sovereign state. Under an agreement signed in Algiers on August 26, 1974, Portugal pulled out its armed forces and administration from the Republic of Guinea-Bissau in October of the same year.

As admitted by the leadership of PAIGC, its victory was made possible by the long years' stubborn armed struggle of the people of that country, the assistance of many African states, primarily the neighbouring Democratic Republic of Guinea, the Organisation of African Unity (Liberation Committee) and the steady, all-round aid from the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union.

At present the leadership of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau is confronted by complicated problems connected with the formative period of the young state. In the foreign policy field the Republic's government is pursuing a policy of non-alignment, operating within the framework of the OAU and in compliance with its Charter and developing friendly relations and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Integration with the Cape Verde Islands is the most crucial aspect of the foreign policy of PAIGC.

In the economic field the first priority task before the government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau is to advance, expand and modernise agricultural production. Because of its economic backwardness Guinea-Bissau, which has a potential for building up an independent economic base, will need economic aid during the coming years.

As a result of FRELIMO's successful struggle and the developments in Portugal its democratic government recognised Mozambique's right to independence. The talks in Lusaka from September 5 to 7, 1974 culminated in an agreement on the proclamation of Mozambique's independence on June 25, 1975, the termination of hostilities and the formation of an interim government, which came into office on September 20, 1974.

The Republic put down attempts at armed struggle on the part of right extremist elements of the white minority and steadily replaced Portuguese forces with FRELIMO units. On November 1, 1974 there were over 14,000 FRELIMO troops in Mozambique.

Under the Lusaka agreement four to five thousand Portuguese troops (of the total 70,000) were evacuated from Mozambique monthly. The FRELIMO leadership took prompt steps

to form a regular army, which was necessary for maintaining law and order, and for national defence.

Despite some difficulties the process of decolonisation of Mozambique was on the whole successful, and the complete independence of the Republic of Mozambique was proclaimed in the summer of 1975. The Republic is led by the FRELIMO party steered in the national liberation struggle, which is guiding the people along the path of social progress. The party is implementing the principle of non-alignment in its foreign policy.

The decolonisation of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola gave rise to a series of new social, economic, political and ideological problems involved in the development of statehood. The imperialist forces have stepped up their efforts to interfere actively in the internal affairs of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola, making use of their difficulties, to influence their political orientation and gain advantageous economic positions for themselves.

The victory of the national liberation forces in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola is of great importance in the general context of struggle against international imperialism and colonialism, particularly on the African continent. Independent Mozambique and Angola are changing the military-political situation in southern Africa and lending urgency to the problem of decolonisation of Namibia, Rhodesia and the RSA. A decisive contribution to the struggle against the remnants of racism and colonialism is being made by the peoples of southern Africa themselves. Their actions, however, would not have been so effective without support from the democratic forces of the whole world in a variety of forms.

The United Nations has been turned into a rostrum for denouncing racism and colonialism by the consistent policies of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and the young developing states. At the 7th session of the UN General Assembly as far back as 1952, the Soviet Union urged the UN members to put an end to the violations of the fundamental principles of the UN Charter by the government of the Union of South Africa.

The Declaration on the eradication of all kinds of racial discrimination, adopted by the 18th session of the UN General Assembly in 1963, makes it incumbent on all states to repeal the laws and regulations generating and perpetuating racial discrimination and calls for an end to be put to the policy of racial segregation, particularly the policy of apartheid, pursued

by some states and authorities. Soviet representatives have repeatedly tabled proposals at the United Nations for applying the harshest sanctions to the RSA which is refusing to comply with these principles. The Soviet Union came out against the unilateral proclamation of Rhodesia's "independence" by the racist minority in November 1965.

On the Soviet Union's initiative the United Nations proclaimed the year 1971 International Year of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

In all its activities on the international scene the Soviet Union abides by the spirit of the UN resolutions declaring the equality of all races and peoples and asserting their right to struggle for their freedom and independence. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries consistently act as loyal friends and allies of the oppressed peoples and are invariably prepared to give them support and aid in their struggle for political and economic independence.

The Soviet people have profound feelings of solidarity with the courageous struggle for national and social liberation being waged by the freedom fighters of Africa. The attitude of Soviet people to the activities of the progressive forces on the African continent is determined by the principles of the Leninist policy on the national question and by a realisation of the important contribution the national liberation movement in Africa is making to the world revolutionary process.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government, loyal as they are to their internationalist duty, invariably take a determined and consistent stand against colonialism and racism, and in support of the peoples struggling for their freedom and independence. The forms of such support and cooperation with different contingents of the national liberation movement are quite varied, ranging from statements by Soviet delegates at the United Nations to all-round economic and military aid.

This broad and multilateral cooperation is exemplified by the relations which have taken shape between the CPSU and the national-revolutionary parties of Africa, particularly the MPLA, FRELIMO, PAIGC and ANC. The establishment of such relations was made possible by the consistent anti-colonial and anti-imperialist policies of the national-revolutionary parties, their striving to develop ties with the socialist community of nations, the Soviet Union first and foremost, and by the ideological proximity of the leaders of these parties to socialism. The CPSU regards the national-revolutionary par-

ties as genuine representatives of the peoples of these countries and recognises the revolutionary character of their armed struggle.

The CPSU's cooperation with the national-revolutionary parties of Africa is exerting an appreciable influence on their policy planning, contributes to the enhancement of the Soviet Union's prestige and to bringing them closer to the ideology of scientific socialism. It stimulates more active anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle and is a major revolutionising factor in the political development of the entire African continent.

World socialism and the international working-class movement are powerful and reliable allies of the national liberation movement in Africa. This is an encouragement to the African fighters for freedom and independence and is the guarantee that the long-suffering people of Africa will wipe out the vestiges of colonialism in their lands and take a wide road of economic and social progress.

The year 1974 in Africa was marked by a political event of international significance: the revolution in Ethiopia which toppled one of the world's most ancient monarchies. The revolution is led by the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic section of the army, which no efforts of the US special services and military and political advisers could turn into obedient tools for suppression of the people.

The new revolutionary-democratic regime has grown out of a national-democratic revolution which has for its aim to build a socialist society. Already the Declaration No. 1 published on September 12, 1974 stated the need for radical changes in the social system in the interests of the people, above all the peasants, who account for 90 per cent of Ethiopia's population.

As it might be expected, the national-democratic revolution did not stop half-way. The elite of the monarchic and bourgeois-bureaucratic aristocracy, guilty of active resistance to the revolution, of stirring counter-revolution against the popular masses, of attempts to restore the old regime and of a criminal disregard for the famished population, was put to death. The revolution defended itself and the people. Only a revolution which can defend itself is a genuine revolution.

The programme of the Ethiopian Government went far beyond the limits of anti-feudal reforms. Already its first decisions put forward demands of an anti-capitalist charac-

ter. Among them was restriction on the activities of private capital and on its exploitation of the working people.

The Ethiopian villages lived under medieval conditions and the peasants were subjected to ruthless exploitation. Their standards of life could hardly be compared even to those of the peasants in any other Asian or African country. Suffice it to mention that the Ethiopian villages had never had the privilege of even half-hearted agrarian reforms, not to speak of anything like the radical anti-feudal reforms carried out in many Afro-Asian countries after the Second World War.

On the eve of the revolution Ethiopia had been hit by a nationwide disaster — a devastating drought which brought a famine in its wake. Hundreds of thousands of indigent people starved to death. The aftermath of this disaster is still to be felt in the young developing state.

On March 4, 1975 the government announced the nationalisation of all farm land, which was made the property of the whole people. Individuals and families are allowed to have plots of up to 10 hectares on condition they till them themselves. Hired labour in agriculture is banned. Large landed estates and farms have been either made the property of the state or of peasant associations (primary cooperatives). The Ethiopian revolution has done away with the system of large, middle and small parasitic landownership, this foundation of the monarchy which prevailed in the country for centuries and which enabled the landlords to appropriate through enslaving feudal rent from 50 to 70 and even 80 per cent of the harvest.

The peasants have displayed a high level of revolutionary awareness and activity. Significantly, the peasants themselves seized the land from the landlords and shared it out among landless and land-starved families. Aided by the state and revolutionary-democratic activists and tens of thousands of students, the peasants have set up agricultural production associations.

The Ethiopian villages are taking a new path of development. There are still many difficulties ahead but there is every evidence that the peasants of Ethiopia with the aid of revolutionary democracy will choose the right road, one of social progress.

Large industrial enterprises, insurance companies and banks and, what is particularly important, the land in towns have been nationalised, too. High officials and the feudal aris-

tocracy will no longer be in a position to engage in land speculation in towns and exact high rents. Housing rent has been reduced, and housing cooperatives are being set up for the working people in towns.

In northern Ethiopia the revolutionary government is confronted by the extremely complicated national problem of Erithrea which is its most developed province economically. Not without encouragement from abroad the Erithrean nationalists are waging armed struggle against the central government for complete secession of Erithrea from Ethiopia.

Whatever solution will be found to this problem, one thing is clear: this is an internal affair of the Ethiopian national-democratic state, and no other state for whatever motives has a right to interfere in the settlement of this intra-national issue. If this *sine qua non* is observed, another alternative is perfectly obvious: to reach a political settlement of this problem without recourse to arms and bogging down in a civil war, which is bound to play into the hands of Ethiopian domestic reaction, as well as Arab reaction, and imperialism.

An entirely new political climate has been created in the country. Marxist-Leninist ideology and literature have been given legal status and are winning influence and popularity within broad sections of the intelligentsia.

The Programme of the National-Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia published on April 21, 1976, which formulated clearly and in detail the ideological and political credo of the leadership of the Provisional Military Administration Council of Ethiopia (PMAC), was a significant event in its political life.

The programme proclaims as its central objectives the complete eradication of feudalism, neocolonial dependence and bureaucratic capitalism, the unity of all anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces in the struggle to build a new Ethiopia and lay a dependable foundation of its transition to socialism.

The programme outlines radical measures to advance the standards of agriculture, develop industry and the national resources, promote public education, public health and social security, and thus to improve as much as possible the welfare and cultural standards of the mass of the people.

The programme sets forth for the first time the stand of the Ethiopian leaders on the national question, which is of crucial importance in the situation prevailing in multinational Ethiopia. The programme states that no nationality shall dominate

another, since the culture, language and religion of each nationality will be recognised as equal. The unity of Ethiopia will be based on the unity of its people in the struggle against feudalism, imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism, against all reactionary forces. The programme sets the task of advancing the development of different nationalities to a common level, first priority being attached to the political, economic and cultural progress of the nationalities and tribes which were formerly subjected to particularly hard exploitation and are lagging in their development.

The programme says that under present conditions the only solution to the national question can be provided on the basis of a right to self-government granted to each nationality. Within the limits of regional autonomy, each nationality of Ethiopia has the right to shape the pattern of its political, economic and social life, to use its native tongue and to elect its representatives to the local government bodies. The right to self-government will be granted in compliance with democratic standards and principles.

In the opinion of the leaders of the PMAC the political education, organisation and mobilisation of broad sections of the working people and of the country's progressive forces is a *sine qua non* of success in implementing the programme. It says that the national-democratic revolution in Ethiopia will triumph if all anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces unite in a popular front cemented and guided by the working-class party. This will be followed by an election to the national assembly (Parliament) carried out on democratic principles and by secret ballot. In accordance with the Constitution adopted by the assembly, Ethiopia will be a people's democratic republic under the political guidance of the working-class party. To this end the PMAC has set up the Provisional Office for Mass Organisational Affairs. It is invested with the duties of organising and mobilising the working people, of propaganda of the ideas of scientific socialism and the Programme of the National-Democratic Revolution, and of preparations for forming the working-class party and public organisations which will make up the revolutionary popular front.

The programme formulates the main principles of Ethiopia's foreign policy: non-alignment, respect for the cause of peace, justice and equality; close cooperation with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and with all national liberation

movements and organisations struggling against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism; non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, support for their policies of preserving national unity and sovereignty; and respect for the Charters of the United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity.

The Programme of the National-Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia is a logical extension and development of the theoretical analysis of the PMAC's home and foreign policy problems. This is another step forward along the path of the country's progressive development attesting to the strong determination of the PMAC leaders to build a socialist society in the future.

The Ethiopian revolution is a graphic practical corroboration of the Marxist-Leninist theoretical propositions on the national-democratic state, the national-democratic stage of the revolution ranging beyond the limits of classical bourgeois revolutions, on the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist and to a certain extent anti-capitalist orientation of such a revolution, and finally on the fact that, given correct guidance, this revolution opens the way towards non-capitalist development.

Angola's Concerns and Hopes

The process of decolonisation came up against the most formidable obstacles in Angola. This was largely attributable to discord among the national forces consequent primarily on the subversive activity of international imperialism within the Angolan national liberation movement. Besides, the Portuguese colons were bent on preserving their positions of privilege and sought support among various nationalistic factions. And last but not least, such enemies of democratic Africa as the RSA and NATO opposed the establishment of a truly independent state in Angola, which has an important location strategically.

Let us turn to the history of the liberation movement in Angola. At a time when in the majority of African countries developments were in full swing which led eventually to the disintegration of the colonial empires of the leading imperialist powers, the national liberation movement in Angola was just gaining momentum. This was primarily due to the fact that backward Portugal had no means of pursuing a neocolonialist policy, had adhered for a long time to a line of conserving the traditional forms of colonial exploitation and used on a broad scale its fascist repressive machinery to put down any manifestation of discontent among the indigenous population.

The Portuguese colonialists preferred to plunder Angola by the "old" methods, making wide use of other than economic coercion, which introduced no essential changes in the

traditional way of life of the indigenous population. Therefore the forces capable of leading the struggle for national liberation matured slowly in Angola. The overwhelming proportion of the peasantry still lived in the conditions of a family-tribal commune. The broad application of a system of compulsory labour, which supplied 60 per cent of industrial manpower, hindered the formation of the working class and tended to distort its self-awareness. The process of the economic, political and cultural consolidation of the population into a single nation was extremely slow. For a long time the anti-colonial movement was confined to the limits of a passive spontaneous boycott, which at times took on a religious colouring. This became manifest, for instance, in the spread in Angola of a peculiar heresy—"Tokoism"—which had an anti-Catholic and anti-Portuguese orientation.

A new stage of the national liberation struggle in Angola began in the fifties under the impact of the deep-going changes which were in evidence in Africa and on the international scene. The national petty-bourgeois strata—administration officials, traders, intellectuals, etc.—became increasingly involved in the anti-colonial movement in Angola in that period. Due to their position in the African society, their proximity to the mechanism of colonial exploitation and sources of information, they objectively became an important factor of the struggle against colonialism. In 1950-1954 attempts were made to set up small groups consisting of members of the middle classes, who took a stand against the colonial policy of "Portugalisation" of the local population. Many members of these groups had been educated in the metropolitan country, where they had got in touch with the democratic forces of the Portuguese people. As far back as 1948 students from Angola, the future President of the MPLA Antonio Agostinho Neto among them, took an active part in setting up in Lisbon the Centre of African Studies to do research into the socio-economic and cultural problems of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies.

For a long time the patriotic movement in Angola had existed as various enlightenment organisations. The cultural associations of local intellectuals had a great role to play in awakening the national self-awareness of the Angolan people. As far back as 1956 political underground groups appeared in the country. These groups had no common opinion on the forms, methods and ultimate goals of their struggle. Many

of them limited their demands to one for granting autonomy to Angola and failed to go further than distributing pamphlets criticising colonialism.

The Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) which was founded on December 10, 1956 became the nucleus round which advocates of a determined fight for freedom and independence began to unite gradually. The MPLA Manifesto to the Angolan people declared that Portuguese colonialism could not be defeated without revolutionary struggle. This struggle could be carried by the people to success if a united front incorporating all the anti-imperialist forces of Angola was set up. The consolidation of the positions of the revolutionary-democratic elements within the MPLA leadership contributed to the organisation soon assuming a clearcut structure and setting up contacts with the popular masses.

Originally the young revolutionaries did not raise the question of violent means of struggle and expected to gain independence by peaceful means. However, they gradually became aware of the need to change their tactics and to widen the front of struggle and its composition by involving broad peasant masses. The MPLA leadership arrived at the conclusion that peaceful demonstrations of working people in towns were not an effective weapon against the fascist colonial regime. On March 29, 1959 the police arrested a group of patriots. On July 8, 1960 Agostinho Neto was arrested in Luanda, and his countrymen from the villages of Ikolo and Bengue who had come out for a demonstration of protest were fired on.

The stepping up of repressions by the colonialists compelled the MPLA leadership to revise their point of view on the ways and means of developing the liberation struggle. The party started intensive preparations for armed struggle, and the first armed units had been formed by 1960. The freedom fighters planned their strategy with an eye to using the territory of the neighbouring Belgian Congo as the basis for developing armed struggle in Angola. In May 1960 a conference of the MPLA leadership took a decision to set up the party's temporary headquarters at Konakry and to prepare an armed uprising by the time when operational opportunities opened up in the north of the country after the Congo had been granted independence.

The Angolan population was trained for armed struggle in

an extremely difficult situation, because the underground fighters had to carry out their work in the midst of the backward peasants who were under a strong influence of the traditional tribal chieftains and village headmen supporting the colonialists. Another hindrance was the tribal strife which had its roots in history and survived both as a result of the geographical separation of the population and of the policy of the colonialists who were constantly inciting one ethnic group against another. In particular, the colonialists succeeded in cultivating strained relations between the main nationalities of Angola—the Ovimbundu and Mbundu, on the one hand, and the northern Bacongo tribes, on the other. Everywhere the peasants expressed their distrust of agitators from towns, many of whom were Mulattoes.

The uniting of the patriotic forces was hampered by the appearance in the African countries neighbouring Angola of numerous emigré groups opposed to the MPLA and preventing the establishment of a united front. The tribalism that was at the core of these organisations made them a convenient tool for fighting revolutionary-democratic elements. It was not accidental, therefore, that the dissenters soon began to receive support from the imperialist powers of the West, which were entrenching themselves in Angola “for future contingencies” and set up contacts with conservative forces in the neighbouring African countries.

The patriots were given a lot of trouble by the activities of the Bacongo tribal elite who had long dreamt of resurrecting the erstwhile “great Kingdom” of Bacongo, later divided by the colonialists between Angola, the Belgian and the French Congo. Such a programme was advanced by the tribalist organisation known as the Union of the Peoples of Northern Angola (UPNA), which nominated for the role of the unifier King a certain Holden Roberto, a member of the tribal elite by birth, who had left Angola for the Belgian Congo as a child. Having realised, however, that in a situation of growing democratic sentiments a monarchistic and tribalist programme might fail to get support from the population, Holden Roberto expressed himself in favour of a republic. When he became President of the organisation he renamed it the Union of the Peoples of Angola (UPA) in 1958 in an effort to camouflage its tribalist character. Raised by American missionaries Holden Roberto never concealed his sympathies for the United States. He constantly enjoyed support from the CIA, which kept

him in the reserve in case Portugal was forced to get out of Angola.

In the face of great difficulties the MPLA succeeded gradually in widening its ties with the rural population. In 1960 the National Union of Angolan Workers (NUAW) was set up on the MPLA's initiative, which was an underground professional organisation and had a great role to play in mobilising the population of towns to struggle. Some time later other mass organisations were formed, which supported the MPLA. The MPLA leadership gave keen attention to developing a campaign of international solidarity with the Angolan people. Towards 1960 the patriots had set up contacts with the governments of many independent African states. In the summer of 1960 a MPLA delegation visited the Soviet Union.

Early in 1961 the MPLA took a decision to begin military operations against the colonialists who had rejected its repeated proposals for a peaceful solution to the problem of Angola's independence. In the opinion of the MPLA leadership an opportune moment for this action presented itself in early February when a large group of foreign journalists arrived in Luanda to meet the Portuguese liner *Santa Maria* which had been seized by a group of anti-fascists shortly before. Their presence could help towards broad coverage of the developments in Angola in the world press.

On February 4, 1961 armed groups of the MPLA in Luanda attacked the São Paulo jail, a radio station and a municipal police station. The attack itself was a failure because the freedom fighters had committed grave mistakes in preparing the armed uprising. However, this gave a signal for the uprising and the party's underground groups in the rural areas began to stir the people to armed struggle. The Angolan people regard this day as a turning-point in their liberation struggle.

The difficulties in preparing a nationwide armed uprising, the lack of experience and certain miscalculations had the result that the active operations of MPLA groups in that period were limited to the northwestern districts of Luanda and Northern Cuanza. The mass actions of the people were, as a rule, spontaneous, which eased the task of the command of the Portuguese colonial army. On February 5 almost 3,000 Africans who supported the military groups of the MPLA

were killed in the capital. About 5,000 cotton plantation workers were killed in the Kassanji district.*

The patriots' operations were complicated by the fact that on March 15, 1961 the armed units of the Union of the Peoples of Angola which had infiltrated from the territory of the Congo (Leopoldville) began massacring white colonists in the Zaire and Uíge districts. According to Holden Roberto himself, in that period his units killed more than 4,000 white settlers.** Whipping up the racist and tribalist sentiments within the ranks of the UPA to fanaticism, he appealed to the Bacongo peasants to intimidate and kill members of other tribes. Before long the units of Holden Roberto, which avoided clashes with the Portuguese army, openly turned their arms against the MPLA.

The clamour raised in the Western press about the UPA and its leader pursued the objective of covering up their true goals—to interfere in every way with the consolidation of the revolutionary-democratic wing within the leadership of the national liberation movement.

In that situation it was, of course, difficult for the MPLA to develop an organised armed struggle. Although until August 1961 the Portuguese army had failed to stabilise the situation in northern Angola it held the military initiative. Punitive troops supported by volunteer units of white colonists infiltrated insurgent areas and burned down whole villages. The cruel reprisals which according to some estimate took a toll of 80,000 African lives, the scarcity of weapons and military experience, the treacherous tactics of Holden Roberto—all this led to a drastic curtailment of the military operations of the guerilla groups of the MPLA against the colonial army at the end of 1961.

The setbacks of the first few months of armed struggle compelled the MPLA to revise its plans of developing the nationwide movement. As far back as August 1961 the MPLA leadership ordered its armed forces to scatter so as to muster up forces for a new offensive. During 1962 the freedom fighters succeeded in transporting a few large consignments of weapons and ammunition into the hinterland of Angola. A large group of members of the MPLA were sent to some independent African states for military training. Throughout 1962 the

* *Angola em armas* (numero especial), Dar es Salaam, 1968, p. 2.

** *Afrique-actuelle*, juin 1967, Paris.

party's armed units carried out no operations against the colonialists on any considerable scale, concentrating on explanatory work among the local population.

The 1st National Conference of the MPLA held in Leopoldville in December 1962, which drew up and adopted the programme, charting the political line and outlining the tasks of the movement, was of major importance for further developing the armed struggle. Measures were worked out to convert the guerilla zones into the basis for further developing military operations, and important decisions were taken to strengthen the organisational structure of the MPLA, widen contacts with independent African states and the democratic forces of the world. The conference elected to the post of MPLA President Agostinho Neto, who had managed to escape the surveillance of the Portuguese political police in June 1962.

In that period Holden Roberto's organisation, which relied mostly on the community of Bacongo emigrants in the Congo (Leopoldville), was stepping up its splitting activities. In March 1962 the UPA united with the Democratic Party of Angola (DPA). On this basis the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) was set up, in which the separatists refused to include the MPLA. On April 5, 1962 Holden Roberto attempted to usurp the right to represent the embattled Angolan people. He proclaimed the formation of the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile (GRAE), almost half of which consisted of his near relatives. The armed units of the FNLA, which made sallies from the territory of the Congo (Leopoldville) into the northern districts of Angola, stepped up their armed provocations against the genuine fighters for independence. Having arrogated police functions on the Angolan-Congolese border, they went out of their way to prevent the movement of the MPLA's insurgent units to Angolan territory.

The separatists' activities were particularly dangerous in the light of the fact that the FNLA received support from the reactionary forces in certain African countries, as well as from the imperialist powers pursuing neocolonialist policies. American arms were supplied to the Kinkosi camp, the FNLA's main base in the Congo, and military training there was conducted under the direction of American instructors. Holden Roberto received substantial financial aid from the American Committee on Africa. Simultaneously the

conservative forces in the Congo (Leopoldville) went out of their way to interfere with the activities of the MPLA which supplied the guerilla areas across the border of this neighbouring state.

Taking advantage of the grave crisis within the MPLA, the Congolese authorities at the OAU Foreign Ministers' Conference in Dakar in August 1963 secured the recognition of the GRAE as the sole representative of the embattled people of Angola and in November of the same year banned the MPLA's activities in Congolese territory and arrested a number of officials of the MPLA's bureau in Leopoldville.

In January 1964 a conference of the MPLA's leading cadres was held in Brazzaville, which again revised the plans of developing the armed struggle. The MPLA took a decision to leave part of its forces in the country's central areas (Dembos and Nambuanguo) and temporarily shift the main emphasis on developing the armed struggle in the territory of Cabinda, drawing on the fraternal assistance of the democratic forces of the Congo (Brazzaville) which had overthrown the reactionary government of Fulbert Youlou. The conference stressed at the same time that the strengthening of organisation inside the country was the only way of stepping up the struggle, while the operations in Cabinda were preparatory to a further expansion of the armed struggle within Angola.

The military operations in Cabinda, which had begun in the summer of 1964, became a school in which the MPLA trained battle-toughened military officers, tested in practice the forms and methods of conducting military operations, political and economic work among the population. Simultaneously, relying on cooperation with the friendly governments of Zambia and Tanzania, the MPLA leadership started preparations for military operations against the colonial army in the eastern areas of Angola. In May 1966 a new front of MPLA military operations was opened in the Moxiko and Cuando-Cubango districts. This was a major triumph for the patriots who had fought their way into a wider battlefield in spite of great difficulties. Having bypassed the garrisons of the Portuguese army the MPLA armed units drove a wedge into the hinterland of Angola over a brief space of time. In October 1966 and March 1967, for the first time after a long interval, MPLA convoys brought a large quantity of arms to the guerillas of the Nambuanguo district.

The Portuguese command openly voiced its concern about

the situation in Angola, and Portugal's Defence Minister, General Manuel Gómez de Araujo, admitted that the MPLA had succeeded in making the conflict more complicated militarily. Formerly Portuguese regular troops had not been stationed in Angola's inner areas, whereas now the Portuguese command had to demarcate special "intervention zones" with a network of bases and garrisons. The Portuguese colonial army in Angola had 50,000 officers and men in 1967.* The zone of operations of the MPLA, however, continued to widen. To aggravate the economic difficulties of the colonialists the guerillas attacked plantations of colonial companies and trade centres, and carried out operations along railway lines.

The socio-economic reforms implemented by the MPLA in the liberated areas greatly contributed to the growing popularity of the armed struggle. The peasants were helped to increase the production of food. Government in the villages was handed over to elected "action committees", and self-defence units were formed. A network of "people's shops" was set up to supply the population with prime necessities. Medical posts and mobile "health teams" functioning in the liberated areas carried out prophylactic examination of the population. Primary schools were opened in the villages, and political cadres and business managers were trained at the Revolutionary Training Centre set up in 1968.

In 1967 the MPLA leadership set a new task: to extend the armed struggle to the whole territory of Angola so as to force the enemy to scatter its forces, to immobilise them and make them unable to carry on offensive operations. Implementing the decision of the leadership guerilla units soon infiltrated the areas of Lunda, Malanje, Bié and other districts. MPLA units stepped up their operations in direct proximity to Luanda. In all by the end of 1968, 10 of the 16 districts with a population of about one million were involved in the armed struggle. Since January 1968 the MPLA headquarters was officially located in Angola's inner areas. The revolutionary armed forces grew stronger and gained experience in fighting. Towards 1969 the MPLA had 4,000 guerilla troops in the north and 7,000 in the east of the country.**

The MPLA's successes aggravated the contradictions in

* *Evolution du rapport des forces en Angola*, février 1968.

** *Vitoria ou morte*, juillet et août 1969, p. 3.

the separatists' camp. Holden Roberto was deserted by his "Minister of Foreign Affairs" Jonas Savimbi, who established an independent organisation, the National Union for Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), in the summer of 1964. Soon after his unsuccessful attempts to form armed units of members of his native Bailundo tribe in southern Angola, Savimbi was exposed as having direct ties with the Portuguese political police.

FNLA units continued their raids on Angola's border areas and brutally massacred the MPLA's supporters. News of the massacre of a large group of MPLA members in the Kinkosi camp in Zaire territory aroused wrath and indignation of world opinion. Faced with incontrovertible facts, the OAU Council of Ministers in February 1968 took a decision to recommend the governments of the African countries to revise the question of recognition of the GRAE. Soon, in September 1968, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU in Algiers refused to recognise it as the sole representative of the embattled forces of the Angolan people.

The claims to leadership of the national liberation struggle on the part of another separatist organisation—the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC) set up on the initiative and with direct participation of Fulbert Youlou in 1962—turned out to be equally groundless. The FLEC failed to win support among the local population and the MPLA was constantly the only recognised leader of the liberation struggle in this part of Angolan territory.

The international movement of solidarity with the freedom fighters of Angola grew wider and stronger. Progressive international organisations, many African countries, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community assisted the MPLA. In 1971 the MPLA President Agostinho Neto declared at the 24th CPSU Congress: "Our people, the fighters representing the vanguard of the anti-colonialist struggle in Angola, feel the friendship and support of the Soviet people. We regard the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as one of the main forces we rely upon in developing our liberation struggle."*

The further expansion of the anti-colonialist struggle in Angola and other Portuguese possessions, which merged into a common revolutionary torrent with the anti-fascist move-

* *Pravda*, April 7, 1971.

ment in Portugal, the development of detente, which contributed to the isolation of the fascist regime, tended to exacerbate considerably the crisis of the system of social relations in the "Portuguese space", as apologists of capitalism liked to call Portugal and its "overseas provinces". Portuguese fascism was compelled to take emergency measures to forestall the disintegration of its colonial empire. This was precisely the objective of the so-called "development plans" aimed essentially at implementing some elements of neocolonialist policy jointly with the international imperialist circles. By attracting vast foreign capital to the colonies the fascist regime attempted to create definite conditions for galvanising economic life, increasing employment, and raising the standards of living, if only slightly. Measures were taken to widen the privileged stratum of the local population. A number of the most notorious political institutions were abolished.

The "open doors" policy pursued by fascist Portugal during the last years of its existence made Angola increasingly open to plunder by the imperialist monopolies. The Portuguese colonialists and international imperialism accompanied their neocolonialist manoeuvres and demagogy with an escalation of the criminal colonial war, and intensified their subversive activities to divide and discredit the patriotic forces.

Such policies cleared the way for traitors to the liberation struggle. Holden Roberto flagrantly violated the agreement reached in December 1972 on coordination of the operations of the MPLA and the FNLA, and was hastily arming Bacongo emigrants in Zaire for another offensive against the revolutionary-democratic wing of the Angolan liberation movement. In the summer of 1973 the reactionary forces launched a campaign to discredit the MPLA, which was alleged to be on the verge of disbandment.

The democratic coup in Portugal on April 25, 1974 frustrated the plans of the colonialists and international reaction. Overcoming the resistance of the conservative forces which sought to delay the process of decolonisation and searched for some neocolonialist variant, Portugal's democratic forces took determined steps for its government to set a seal on the five centuries of enslavement of other peoples. The anti-colonialist position of Portugal's provisional government and the Armed Forces Movement largely contributed to the process of decolonisation, in Angola in particular.

At the same time, the international imperialist forces,

apprehensive for their positions in this area of Africa famed for its natural wealth and assigned an important role to play in the policy of neocolonialist offensive against the independent African states, went out of their way to retard the process of Angola's decolonisation. Relying on collaboration with Portuguese domestic reaction, primarily with Portugal's ex-President, General Antonio Spínola, they made the question of granting Angola independence on November 11, 1975 dependent on a recognition of the right of the FNLA and UNITA to take part in the interim government.

Loyal to the cause of liberation of the Angolan people, the MPLA actively joined in the work of decolonisation. By its collaboration in the interim government which came into office in February 1975, in forming new government bodies and units of the national army and in setting up mass organisations of the working people, which assumed much of the work in bringing life in towns back to normal, the MPLA did its best to safeguard the vital interests of the Angolan people at the new responsible stage of the struggle for national independence. The local population enthusiastically welcomed the patriots who had proved their allegiance to the cause of liberation during the 13 years of armed struggle.

The progress of decolonisation, however, posed a real threat to the positions of the imperialist powers in the former Portuguese colonies. This was precisely why international imperialism stepped up its subversive activities against the liberation forces to be able to hold on to this fabulously rich region of Africa and simultaneously to create additional difficulties for Portugal's democratic forces. It soon became evident that in the new situation imperialism was determined to go into its first open battle against the national liberation forces of the former Portuguese colonies precisely in Angola, where the national forces were divided and reaction had managed to retain fairly strong positions. It was here that imperialism took steps to interfere with the transfer of power to the patriots in a normal situation and complicate the Portuguese government's cooperation with the national government bodies taking shape in Angola.

The enemies of Angola's true independence again directed their main strike against the MPLA, which had put forward a programme of radical reforms and resolute measures to restrict the domination of the national economy by foreign monopolies. The National Front for the Liberation of Angola

(FNLA), which had entrenched itself in Zaire, took an especially hard line against the MPLA.

Leaning on the support of the Portuguese big bourgeoisie and US aid, the FNLA gradually stepped up its provocations against the MPLA, which impeded the work of the interim government and created a favourable situation for the reanimation of all the forces of domestic reaction. Pockets of "white resistance" supplied with arms from the RSA began to spring up in the country's central areas. The secret services of the imperialist powers became more active in Luanda.

International imperialism had thoroughly prepared itself for battle with the patriotic forces of Angola. At the NATO Council session in Brussels in May 1975 the Western powers discussed the question of carving up Angola into spheres of influence. Simultaneously a special coordinating committee was set up of representatives of Britain, Belgium, the USA, France and the FRG. In that period the Western powers decided to abstain from direct military intervention in Angola. They chose to use as their strike force the FNLA units formed in Zaire territory and reinforced with Zaire troops.

From April to June 1975 Holden Roberto and Jonas Savimbi had meetings in Paris, under the aegis of the NATO coordinating committee, with emissaries of General Spínola and representatives of the Portuguese industrialists. The latter assured the FNLA of the neutrality of Portuguese troops in Angola, and the FNLA promised to preserve the "system of economic liberalism" in the event of its coming to power in Angola.

Aware of the fact that the separatists had no strong support among the population, international imperialism faced them with the task of creating in Angola a situation favourable for an intervention by foreign reaction. This was precisely the purpose of the reign of terror unleashed against the civilian population by the FNLA gangs which had invaded Luanda from Zaire. Holden Roberto finally discarded all his commitments assumed at the meetings of the leaders of the Angolan nationalist organisations in Mombasa in January 1975 and in Nakuru in June 1975 and attempted to seize power in Luanda by force of arms.

International imperialism was safeguarding the "rear" of the separatists. The FNLA was openly supported by the North American imperialists. White mercenaries were hastily recruited to Holden Roberto's units. The FNLA received

military equipment from the FRG under the guise of medical supplies. Large consignments of military equipment arrived at the FNLA bases in Zaire from France, and "specialists" who had arrived from Brazil helped Holden Roberto to organise information and intelligence services. The separatists widened their collaboration with the militarised fascist organisations of the local racists.

In July 1975 when the cause of Angola's independence was again in jeopardy the MPLA, in response to the FNLA's armed provocations and with unreserved support of the population, expelled Holden Roberto's troops from Luanda. The mercenary gangs were ousted from other large towns as well. Towards September 1975 the MPLA was in control of 12 of the country's 16 districts. The FNLA, however, having recalled its representatives from the interim government, declared "a total war" on the MPLA and moved its troops across the Angolan-Zairean border in the direction of Luanda. Simultaneously Jonas Savimbi, the leader of UNITA, which had long played the role of a "third force" seeking to gain political capital, opened military operations against the MPLA.

The South African racists actively contributed to building up tensions in Angola. Expecting to convert Angola into a "buffer state" to help the RSA's neocolonialist expansion northwards, the Pretoria authorities expressed special sympathies for Jonas Savimbi, who enjoyed support from the conservative forces in certain African states, although Holden Roberto was also allowed to recruit and arm mercenaries in the RSA territory.

Already in August 1975 racist units attempted an invasion of Angola to back up UNITA troops fleeing from the MPLA fighters and face the world with the fact of "internationalisation" of the Angola problem. However, the triumphant advance of MPLA units and the stern condemnation of the intervention by world opinion forced the racists to withdraw their troops in that period. Having looted the municipal facilities at Ngiva and seized the documents and archives of the administration of Kunene province, the RSA troop convoy supported by tanks and helicopters beat a retreat.

The attempts to usurp power on the part of the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC), which had never ventured to join the ranks of the active fighters against Portuguese colonialism during all these years, also ended in a complete fiasco. Having won support from the African

units of the former colonial army and leaning on the assistance of the North American oil companies which had entrenched themselves in this part of the Angolan territory, the FLEC attempted to stir up a separatist movement in Cabinda as far back as November 1974. After a resolute rebuff from the local population and MPLA units the FLEC leadership fled to Zaire.

In a situation of incessant provocations on the part of domestic and foreign reaction, which tried to prevent the triumph of the cause of national liberation, the patriotic forces of Angola, rallied around the MPLA, rose in defence of the gains of the liberation revolution. The MPLA's appeal for nationwide resistance aroused the mass of the people to active fight against the separatists and interventionists. Leaning on the support of the population MPLA activists immediately got down to work to organise administration and economic life and strengthen the bodies of the popular government. The life in towns gradually got back to normal, and many of the European settlers who had left for Portugal earlier started coming back to Angola.

The enemies of independent Angola, however, were unwilling to lay down their arms. Holden Roberto mounted a massive offensive on Luanda from the northern provinces of Zaire and Uié occupied by the FNLA units. In October 1975 mercenary troops from the RSA again crossed the border into Angola to help UNITA troops advancing towards the capital. The interventionists expected to drive the MPLA out of Luanda or at least to seize as much of the country's territory as they could and create a pretext for defying the declaration of independence slated by the MPLA for November 11, 1975.

In the face of this new grave threat to the cause of national independence the patriotic forces of Angola again rose up in defence of their gains. The general mobilisation announced by the MPLA in Luanda was carried out successfully. Leaning on the support and assistance of the world public, the countries of the socialist community and the progressive forces of Africa, the MPLA, which had borne the brunt of the fighting against Portuguese colonialism, again demonstrated its devotion to the cause of Angola's liberation. The advance of the interventionists towards Luanda was checked.

The government and military circles of the Western countries, losing their trust in the ability of the FNLA and UNITA

to achieve a decisive victory, started talking more and more openly of the need to "internationalise" the Angola problem and prepare the ground for stationing a UN police force in the country. The governments of some African countries, hostile to the MPLA and unwilling in defiance of facts to recognise its nationwide popularity, also attempted to give support to the separatists, taking advantage of their positions within the OAU.

Undoubtedly, in a situation where the MPLA was strongly determined to carry into effect the programme of establishing a united democratic state in Angola, any encroachment on the right of the MPLA to represent the Angolan people might become a loophole for those who over all these years of struggle had been sitting it out in emigration and were now openly collaborating with imperialism, thus betraying the cause of independence. It was not accidental, therefore, that the progressive public of Africa voiced its deep concern about the escalation of the military aid of the imperialist powers to the enemies of Angola's decolonisation. The will of all progressive forces of the world, which demanded that the Angolan people should be allowed to shape their destinies themselves, was strikingly demonstrated at the international conference in Lourenço Marques in September 1975, as well as by the week of international solidarity with the Angolan people held under the motto "Against Neocolonialist Intervention in Angola's Affairs".

In the meantime the developments continued to gain momentum. On November 11, 1975 Angola was proclaimed independent at a solemn ceremony in Luanda, and a new state—the People's Republic of Angola (PRA)—appeared on the map of Africa. The MPLA President Agostinho Neto was elected President of the country. The first few months of the existence of the young republic were marked by the further mobilisation of forces for repelling the imperialist and racist aggression covered up by the FNLA and UNITA separatists. The RSA racists moved into Angola its regular troops and mercenaries, seized the southern districts and a considerable part of the Atlantic coast. From the north Luanda was threatened by the FNLA troops and the units of the Zaire army taking part in the intervention. The interventionist forces relied on the military, financial and diplomatic support of the USA, France and other imperialist states. The economic blockade introduced by the Western powers

aggravated the economic dislocation. The MPLA leadership and the PRA government, leaning on the support of the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, and also of the progressive African states, continued to defend consistently the national interests and independence by force of arms. The national army of the Republic not only threw back the interventionists from Luanda but also dealt a devastating blow to the FNLA gangs in the north of the country and went over to the offensive against the RSA regular army and the mercenaries in the south.

The attempts of the imperialist forces to isolate the PRA have failed. At the Extraordinary Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU in January 1976, independent Africa denounced the imperialist and racist aggression in Angola, and all its direct and indirect participants. The international prestige of the young African state steadily rose. The Emergency Conference for Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia and Africa held in Luanda in February 1976 took a determined stand for ending immediately the intervention of the imperialists and racists in Angola's affairs, and for setting up a united, independent and democratic state in Angola.

The consistent support of the PRA by the countries of the socialist community, the progressive forces of Africa and the whole world was the most important factor in the Angolan people's struggle against the intervention of the imperialist and racist forces. Late in March 1976 South African racist and mercenary troops were forced to pull out of the Angolan territory.

The debacle of the imperialist aggression against the People's Republic of Angola demonstrated again that the unity of all revolutionary forces is the guarantee of success in the struggle waged by the peoples of the world against imperialism.

The MPLA, which the Constitution of the Republic entrusted with the political, economic and social guidance of the nation, and the PRA government started to build a new life in an extremely difficult situation. The majority of enterprises had been put out of commission by the colonialists. On the main transport arteries the interventionists blew up bridges, which resulted in grave stoppages in food supply to towns. The difficulties were made still worse by the flight of a large proportion of specialists of European origin provoked by the reactionaries. There was no adequate experience in

economic management and a shortage of native personnel.

President Neto declared that Angola had chosen the socialist path of development. In view of this historical prospect the MPLA and the PRA government announced their intention to carry on national reconstruction by methods which would restrict the activity of private capital and strengthen public ownership, facilitate the establishment of popular government bodies controlled by the workers and peasants, and help the people's democratic revolution adopt the scientific ideology of the working class.

The PRA leadership are implementing sweeping democratic reforms to strengthen national independence, advance the living standards of the toiling masses and set up truly popular organs of government. The country's main natural resources have been placed under state control. The refusal of foreign companies to submit to government control and overt sabotage on their part had the result that food, textile, cement and steel industry enterprises were proclaimed state property in May 1976. This was followed by the nationalisation of fishing companies, glassworks and metalworking factories. State organisations started to restore industry in cooperation with the workers' commissions set up at enterprises.

In 1976 the people's first harvest of coffee and sugar cane was gathered, and large foreign merchant firms were deprived of their monopoly right to the purchase and marketing of these products vital to the national economy. The people's commissions—elected committees set up on the working people's initiative—have become a dependable support for the government. On February 2, 1976 the Revolutionary Council, which is the supreme legislative and executive body of the PRA, officially recognised the people's commissions as the organs of government, through which the working people shall govern the country under the leadership of the MPLA.

The young republic has embarked on sweeping social reforms: free medical service and education have been introduced, and measures have been taken to supply the population with prime necessities and food. The institution of government control over the activities of the banks and the monetary reform implemented in January 1977 dealt a heavy blow at the positions of the exploiter groups.

The nationwide support for the MPLA policy, the determination displayed by the government of the young republic in defending national interests, the successes in economic reha-

bilitation and the consistent support from the countries of the socialist community—all this enables the PRA to oppose imperialist diktat effectively.

Nevertheless, international reaction has not abandoned its plans of aggression against Angola. In an effort to regain its lost positions imperialism has begun active subversion in Angola to complicate as much as possible the development of the young republic. The international monopolies and banks are persisting in their economic boycott of Angola. The Western bourgeois press has launched a campaign to discredit the PRA on the international scene. Imperialism is again pinning its hopes on the leaders of the defeated reactionary groups who have fled to the neighbouring countries. NATO arms supplies continue to arrive at the bases on the Angolan border from where the traitors are attempting to organise subversive activities in the country.

In the face of this real danger people's Angola is building up its defence capability. Leaning on the support of the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, the People's Liberation Armed Forces of Angola (FAPLA) are developing and growing stronger. In the struggle for consolidating the revolutionary gains the Angolan leadership give keen attention to strengthening the MPLA and enhancing its role in the state system. They regard the conversion of the MPLA into a party of a new type, the vanguard of the toiling masses, as a prerequisite for the development of the Angolan revolution.

The achievements made by the Angolan people in the cause of national construction are closely associated with the support and assistance given to the young republic by the progressive independent African states and the countries of the socialist community. "Soviet aid has been the key factor in our historical development, in achieving independence and in the country's reconstruction," President Neto stated during his visit to the Soviet Union in October 1976.*

The relations of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Angola are developing successfully. A number of agreements on economic cooperation, trade, shipping, fishing, etc. have been signed. On October 8, 1976 Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the

* *The Visit of the Party and Government Delegation of the People's Republic of Angola to the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1976, p. 13 (in Russian).

CPSU Central Committee, and President of the MPLA and the PRA, Dr. Antonio Agostinho Neto, signed the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and the PRA.

Every new victory of the People's Republic of Angola in its fight against economic dislocation and the intrigues of reaction and imperialism, every new success in its daily work of construction testify to the Angolan people's strong determination to achieve peace, progress and happiness for their homeland.

The Battle of Ideas over the Ways of Socio-Economic Development

In the last decade, for the first time in its centuries-old history, Africa has become the scene of an extremely tense internal ideological and political struggle which flared up in all other continents of the world much earlier. For all the variety and dissimilarity of the conditions prevailing in different parts of the world the struggle in Africa is in the final analysis a contest between the forces of capitalism and socialism, revolution and reaction, national independence and oppression.

An irreconcilable conflict between the two social systems is developing in the whole of the African continent. Imperialism uses its political, economic and military power to preserve its positions of domination, to support the colonialist and racist regimes still surviving in Africa, to strengthen neocolonialism and prolong the period of exploitation of the African peoples. The Soviet Union and the socialist community see their task and their duty in wiping out the last strongholds of racism and colonialism, in supporting the just struggle waged by the peoples of the former colonial countries for complete national independence and in helping them to break the chains of economic bondage and free themselves from all forms of imperialist and neocolonialist exploitation.

The struggle between the forces of capitalism and socialism in Africa is not limited to this conflict alone. It is wider in scope and greater in depth. This struggle is being waged in the first place by the internal forces in the process of the in-

ternal social differentiation of the African peoples, as well as under the impact of the main contradiction of our day on a global scale. The ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in Africa is attributable to the fact that the African countries liberated from direct political oppression are now practically faced with the question as to which way to follow, where to direct the labour and struggle of the multi-million masses awakened to political life, what system—capitalism or socialism—would ensure complete national liberation and social progress.

There is no doubt that capitalism has to struggle for the minds of the Africans under disadvantageous conditions. It has discredited itself so much in their eyes and so closely identified itself with the atrocities of colonialism and imperialist exploitation that it can no longer lay claim to general recognition as a prospect for the continent's development. It is not accidental that almost all African leaders today address their peoples under socialist slogans. While being fully aware of the significance of this fact attesting to the bankruptcy of capitalism and to the immense force of attraction possessed by socialism, it should not be presumed, however, that a verbal recognition of socialist ideas in general form invariably means a truly socialist choice.

In Africa today, just as in other parts of the world, both "pre-capitalism" and capitalism have to camouflage themselves. The almost universal recognition of socialist slogans by no means indicates that capitalism has no scope for operation, has proved a total failure and can be written off, and that the struggle between capitalism and socialism has ended. On the contrary, this struggle is being carried on everywhere and every day in all spheres of life, in politics and in ideology.

All African countries have many tasks in common in strengthening their national independence, ensuring their economic growth and advancing the welfare and cultural standards of the people. Some common features and principles, common social forms and institutions, methods of economic management and political leadership are also observed in the economic and political life of many African countries. Nevertheless, one can clearly discern behind them the emergence of different class and political trends, the gravitation of some forces towards an orientation on socialism, and of others, towards the bourgeois national-reformist "models of evolution". A comparative analysis of contemporary political thought in

the African countries reveals with adequate clarity and profundity a certain similarity and differentiation on the political scene of the African continent.

A genuine test for any political doctrine, the socialist one in the first place, is provided by practice, since the latter alone enables one to size up the real value of the proposed ideas. When it is a question of development trends alone, however, the ideological platform of the individuals and the social forces behind them is quite important for defining their character, if only such a platform is not utterly demagogic.

A detailed examination of the platforms of the ruling parties and the leaders of African countries confirms that a few socio-class trends have emerged or are in the formative stage in African political life, and that the differences between them in a number of fields have become differences of principle, although all of them are often united by some common attitudes. On the ideological plane these differences often appear in more salient relief than on the economic, political or social plane.

Indeed, in examining the economic and political life of the young African states we shall discover in most of them a mixed economy and private enterprise (to a varying extent, it is true), state planning and a one-party system, great centralisation of government, etc. These phenomena which seem identical at first glance are of different types and often exhibit different tendencies, which become strikingly evident when comparing political ideas. Suffice it to compare, for instance, the concepts of the economic foundation of socialism, the private sector and its relation to socialism held by the ideologists of Algeria and Tunisia, Senegal and Guinea to see that they follow fundamentally different trends of socio-political thought.

Contemporary socio-political thought in the African countries (this does not apply to Marxist thought, which gains growing recognition there) may be divided into three major trends. These are national-bourgeois reformism, petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism, and national democracy associated with the socialist orientation of young African states, i.e. with a non-capitalist path of development. Despite certain differences on this question in Marxist literature (some scholars deem it unjustifiable to define petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism as a separate trend), such a classification is on the whole gaining recognition. The presentation of anti-imperialist petty-

bourgeois socialism as a specific trend of African political thought carries weight. It applies accurately to societies dominated by petty-bourgeois anarchy with strong patriarchal-communal traditions. The petty-bourgeois strata in town and country constitute the bulk of the population. Small wonder, therefore, that their sentiments not only leave an imprint on the ideological platforms of African nationalists but also become an independent trend of socio-political thought, if only unstable and intermediate between national-reformism and national democracy.

African national-reformism, which is a typical manifestation of bourgeois nationalism in a new situation, is characterised by a strong influence of the modern bourgeois-reformist conceptions of the West concerning the amended nature of capitalism and the modern state allegedly standing above classes. The ideologists of the national-bourgeois wing of African social thought deny the applicability of the Marxist analysis of the historical process to African conditions, and are opposed especially vehemently to the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle. The thesis on national and sometimes on racial exclusiveness is most commonly used exactly to disprove Marxism once again, as it were, and transplant the bourgeois conceptions of affluent society onto African soil. Such ideas are propagated by the Socialist International and some European Social-Democratic parties, which have considerably increased their infiltration of the African countries and of the social thought of African democracy.

National, or revolutionary, democracy is a promising, revolutionary trend of African political thought and practice distinguished by intransigence towards modern capitalism and assimilating many elements of scientific socialism. The majority of national-democratic movements and ideologists recognise the universal laws of historical development and the doctrine of class struggle. The national democrats are implementing sweeping social reforms preparing the ground for socialism. In the recent period the vanguard role of the working class in social transformations has been mentioned in the programmes of some parties and the statements of some revolutionary ideologists.

African petty-bourgeois political thought has stopped half-way between national-reformism and national democracy. On the one hand, it is characterised by frank anti-imperialism, sincere anti-capitalist sentiments and loyalty to the peo-

ple's ideas of equality and justice. On the other hand, the petty-bourgeois Utopians are still scared of scientific socialism, are unable to renounce the bourgeois concepts of scientific socialism and hence have not yet rid themselves of mistrust of it, which has been overcome to a definite extent or, to be more exact, is being overcome relatively successfully by the national democrats. The subjective socialism of African petty-bourgeois political thought combines with reformist illusions of a largely patriarchal, Utopian character.

It may seem that petty-bourgeois Utopianism is fully retrospective. However, the fact that retrograde concepts, which are at first glance based exclusively on traditions, are capable of working for the future and serving the interests of progress, if they are not devoid of revolutionary elements, i.e. anti-colonialism, anti-racism, anti-imperialism and democracy, is a characteristic feature of backward agrarian societies. Lenin noted this circumstance in his analysis of Sun Yat-senism. Petty-bourgeois Utopian socialism in Africa is also capable of playing a positive role as long as it remains loyal to the working people's ideals. In such cases it draws closer to national democracy and discards certain illusions. If bourgeois reformism takes the upper hand in the contradictory complex of petty-bourgeois concepts, they merge increasingly into the national-bourgeois views and gradually lose their revolutionary potential.

The central problem of estimation of contemporary political thought in Africa may be formulated as follows: socialism or nationalism?

There is no universal solution to this problem, however. The appeals for socialism in Africa have been made in an extremely unusual situation. They are motivated not so much by the severe class antagonisms within the local society as by the national liberation movement against imperialism — exploiter foreign capitalism. They are conditioned not by the maturity of national capitalism but by its underdevelopment — the country's general backwardness in the face of an external enslaving force, which has penetrated deeply into the social life of the people. The recourse of the majority of the African leaders to socialist slogans is attributable primarily to the fact that socialism quite naturally appeals to them as the best if not the only method of progressive social development. In the opinion of African leaders the prime task of socialism is to ensure the rapid development of young states, to

strengthen their independence, which is quite logical and understandable.

Various social movements merge in the socialist concepts now prevailing in Africa. Here we witness the striving of the vanguard of the working people to achieve social justice on the basis of the class struggle, and the illusions of the main mass of the petty-bourgeois population in the spirit of the patriarchal "Golden Age" and "family" relations between classes, and the inclination of national-bourgeois elements to using the popularity of socialism for the so-called modernisation of society and creating the conditions for a rapid growth of national capital. The contradictions and struggle between these two tendencies are obvious. However, their ability to coexist with one another in some measure, at times even within the framework of one political organisation, is attributable not only to the inadequate class differentiation and the uncertainty of the concepts of African ideologists but also to the objective coincidence of the interests of different social forces in the struggle against imperialism and for safeguarding national independence and progress. Hence the non-uniform character of the class basis of the so-called African ideology, which has also adopted socialist slogans, and the intertwining within it of elements of socialism and nationalism.

Small wonder, therefore, that under these conditions African politicians and ideologists interweave socialist doctrine into the fabric of African nationalism, and "socialism" is placed, as it were, at the service of anti-imperialist and anti-racist nationalism. At the same time, the very content of socialism is interpreted merely as a means of ensuring the country's independent development, not infrequently regardless of the class character of political power and social transformations. Such an interpretation of socialism is quite common in Africa, and, as is only natural, Western bourgeois politicians and ideologists, the right-wing Social-Democrats in particular, stake on this when alleging wishfully that true socialism has no prospects in Africa, that Africa will inevitably adopt "Western democracy" which is in fact capitalism in neocolonialist disguise. It is only natural that they ignore not only the subjective aversion of many social strata of the African peoples to capitalism, which for them has come to be a synonym of colonialism, but also the objective conditions urging them to a road leading away from capitalism.

Many African statesmen cannot but see that the develop-

ment of capitalist social relations, which doom African countries to integration into the world capitalist economic system, is linked with the continued exploitation, the unequal exchange with the economies of the imperialist states, the exuberant flourishing of new forms of colonialism and the widening gulf between the levels of development of the capitalist countries of Europe and America, on the one hand, and the neocolonial African periphery, on the other. It is precisely this circumstance that compels the governments of many African countries to choose a non-capitalist path of development, to implement radical social reforms of an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly and, more and more often, also anti-capitalist character.

The non-capitalist path of development opens up socialist prospects before the African countries. It requires, above all, precautions against an unfounded, sometimes misguided domestic policy characterised by unwarranted haste in implementing radical reforms and by isolation from the masses, close friendship with the world socialist system and consistent anti-imperialism while conducting socialist-oriented home and foreign policies. Selfless constructive work in production will become for the African peoples a highroad towards socialism.

The problem of socialism and nationalism in Africa cannot be resolved correctly if the real opportunities for non-capitalist development are ignored. The doctrine of non-capitalist development contains the Marxist methodological approach which gives a correct solution to the problem of relationship between socialism and nationalism in Africa.

In estimating the socialist orientation of the progressive African states, two extremes may be pointed out, which lead in effect to a negation of the contemporary Marxist interpretation of non-capitalist development. Both are dangerous to a correct estimation of the ideological platform of national democracy.

On the one hand, this is the tendency to identify the platform of national democracy with scientific socialism, referring to numerous statements of African politicians about their recognition of scientific socialism by borrowing a number of Marxist principles and formulas. Such an assessment of national democracy would err against reality, fail to take account of the entire complexity of the transition period of non-capitalist development and give a mistaken description of the class strata directing this exceedingly important socio-

economic and political experiment, if it may be called so. Such an estimation is linked with idealisation of national democracy and oblivion of the serious differences between the national democrats and the Marxists, which, however, are not decisive at the present stage and do not inevitably lead to a division between them.

On the other hand, a nihilistic, rigidly dogmatic, sectarian negation of non-capitalist development as a step towards socialism is also dangerous. The logical outcome of this stand is full denial to national democracy of any socialist content whatsoever. The revolutionary, anti-capitalist character of national democracy is rejected; it is alleged to be a common manifestation of national-reformism, i.e. bourgeois nationalism, and no distinction is drawn between national-revolutionary democracy and other, reformist, national-bourgeois trends in African political thought.

It is said in such cases that the truth evidently lies somewhere in the middle. One would try in vain to search for this golden mean; it is simply non-existent. The Marxist conception of non-capitalist development is based on the fact that in many African countries the conditions for immediate construction of socialism have not yet arisen. If this is so, anti-colonialist nationalism has not yet become outdated, nor has it ceased to be a progressive factor in definite spheres of struggle. Hence the objective law of combination of elements of socialism and nationalism in the process of struggle against imperialism, and of the tasks of two fundamentally different stages of revolution—the national liberation and general democratic, and the socialist, although this by no means amounts to the development of the one into the other. These are far from all but the most important qualitative characteristics of non-capitalist development under the guidance of national democracy.

National democracy should not be reduced to nationalism, as is done by the opponents of the conception of non-capitalist development. Nationalism in itself is not uniform. There is reformist, bourgeois nationalism guarding the interests of the privileged classes, ready to make and really making compromise deals with imperialism to the detriment of the newly-won national independence. There is radical, revolutionary nationalism intolerant of imperialism and neocolonialism, permeated with democratism, capable of taking bold measures not only against foreign, but also against local exploiters,

venturing to change the social mode of production and hence ceasing to be nationalism per se. Such is national-revolutionary democracy, its best part anyway.

It is obvious that the real content of anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist practices in these two cases is quite different. In the first case, socialist ideas camouflage what is basically a national-bourgeois platform (although the influence exerted by the democratic forces through these ideas on the leadership gravitating towards bourgeois "models" cannot be ruled out). In the second case, socialist ideas are the basis for a progressive popular movement, which is not yet consistently socialist but is capable of implementing many measures necessary for building socialism eventually and of a radical change of home and foreign policies. National democracy is contradictory, and its policy is characteristically wavering, but at the same time it is radical, revolutionary, and capable of accomplishing eventually the tasks of the present general democratic stage in the development of the African countries. Needless to say, the degree of consistency and success in handling this enormous task is directly proportional to the degree of consistency in implementing an anti-imperialist policy, democratisation of the regime, and the extent of reliance on the popular masses and of drawing closer to scientific socialism and the world socialist system.

It would be wrong to presume that because of the manifestation of petty-bourgeois revolutionary spirit the activity of national democracy and national democracy itself are of a negative character and hostile to socialism. National-democratic, non-proletarian revolutionary sentiments have not yet arisen or matured enough to become the main factor of social development. Revolutionary democracy can be a staunch ally of the proletariat if it does not slide back to the positions of the national bourgeoisie but breaks away from them.

The proletariat and the radical petty-bourgeois strata have always had many interests in common. The ability of the proletariat and its party to assess these common interests correctly and to express them jointly in cooperation with the revolutionary democrats, to take account of the position of its petty-bourgeois partners and to strengthen its alliance with them is crucial in the final analysis to the success of its mission as the vanguard of the revolutionary forces irrespective of whether it is recognised as the vanguard by the petty-bourgeois masses and parties or not yet recognised as such, espe-

cially in countries where the petty-bourgeois strata constitute the bulk of the population and hence their conduct largely determines the direction of development. Of course, as Lenin underscored, "the petty-bourgeois masses cannot help vacillating between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat".* This refers not only to the reformist but also to the revolutionary part of the petty bourgeoisie. This, however, by no means frees the Marxists from the need for a differential approach to the petty-bourgeois masses, for seeking an understanding with them and making a firm alliance with all petty-bourgeois strata capable of playing a positive role in the revolution, and for preserving at the same time their political independence and a clearcut class position.

What course of evolution will be taken by national democracy will be shown by the future. Today it has clearly transpired that it is not homogeneous. Two wings with a centre between them are taking shape within it. One of them seeks to promote the socialist tendencies and draw closer to scientific socialism, and opposes anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. The other is apprehensive of further steps in the direction of socialism and has taken up a wait-and-see attitude, failing to notice that thereby it dooms itself to a slide-back into the quagmire of national-reformism, the abandonment of which was a qualitative leap in the development of political thought and the revolutionary movement. Which of these tendencies will take the upper hand? Probably in different countries the conflict between them will not resolve identically. It can be safely asserted, however, that on the African and, to a certain degree, on the Asian continent national democracy has already played, and its finest representatives will play in the future, a progressive, revolutionising role, that it has stepped up the political activity of the masses, helped popularise the ideas of socialism, carried out a series of radical social reforms and proved to be a historically necessary stage in steady progressive development.

We often refer quite reasonably to the growing attraction of creative Marxism-Leninism. It is precisely this theory and its immense attraction that are responsible for the unprecedented and unusually important phenomenon of today: even the general democratic movements of anti-imperialist, anti-

* V. I. Lenin, "To What State Have the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks Brought the Revolution?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 118.

colonialist and anti-racist orientation, which differ from Marxism-Leninism ideologically, borrow some of its fundamental ideas and principles. This is indicative and in most cases effective, of course. Small wonder, therefore, that at times some ideologists of these movements depict their theoretical and political conceptions as Marxist-Leninist ones without taking the trouble to make a profound study of Marxism-Leninism and to assimilate it as an integral, indivisible, all-embracing teaching in which all components without exception make up an organic whole.

Marxist-Leninist theory does not tolerate its mechanical dissection into parts. At the same time, it cannot be a mechanical combination of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook with ideological conceptions evolved in the conditions of petty-bourgeois revolutionary nationalism, let alone national-reformism.

Nevertheless, a close political alliance between representatives of the ideology of scientific socialism and representatives of the national liberation, anti-imperialist movement, whatever mutually acceptable organisational and political form it may take, inside a country or between countries is not only historically possible and desirable but is imperatively demanded by the entire course of the common struggle against imperialism. It is precisely this alliance that provides the major guarantees of a common victory and the growing ideological and political accord between scientific socialism and the revolutionary-democratic, anti-imperialist movement in the liberated countries.

In the historical aspect, therefore, the problem is not to depict the ideology of revolutionary democracy as scientific socialism, which would be an unpardonable delusion, to say the least, nor to reduce scientific socialism to the level of awareness of the petty-bourgeois masses but to take the road of broad and close cooperation in the name of the interests of the nation and the working people not in word but in deed, in the process of joint struggle of the two contingents against imperialism and for social progress.

There is no doubt that this road, however difficult it may be, if followed without groping in the dark or deviating from honest service of the people, will lead to the ultimate goal—socialism, and the forces fighting for it—to a closer alliance and later to integration on the basis of scientific socialism.

Subject Index

- Aggression — 83, 193, 195, 199, 200, 202, 204, 297, 307, 311, 371
- Agrarian reform — 83, 125, 128, 140, 161, 170, 172, 239, 267, 283-285, 316, 344
- Anti-communism — 171, 179, 184-186, 201, 269, 272, 273, 286, 385
- Anti-imperialist front — 30, 52, 81, 95, 113, 114, 138, 145, 170, 180, 181-183, 187-191, 201, 249, 253, 260, 261, 263, 264, 267, 287, 323, 328, 342, 358, 359
- Anti-Sovietism — 179, 185, 186, 195, 201, 269, 272, 273, 385
- Apartheid — 309, 311, 329, 331, 333, 337, 350
- Burma Revolutionary Council — 267, 280-294, 296-299
- Capitalism — 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 39, 40, 42, 44, 47-50, 52-54, 59-65, 84, 92, 95, 96-102, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 118, 124, 125, 134, 137, 153, 154, 159, 167-169, 182, 183, 196, 197, 198, 245, 247-248, 265-272, 283, 285, 289, 299, 309, 313, 315, 323, 324, 328, 376, 377, 379, 381, 382
- Chauvinism — 14, 32, 111-113, 134, 139, 143, 148, 272, 297
- Class struggle — 7, 9, 10, 13-15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 26, 32, 33, 37, 49, 81, 110, 135, 150, 152, 160, 170, 179, 196, 197, 243, 249-251, 260, 272, 276, 289, 297, 321, 379, 381
- Collapse of the colonial system — 89, 90, 167, 168, 307, 316, 366
- Colonialism — 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 35, 47, 49, 62, 81, 92, 103, 108, 133, 142, 145, 152, 167, 168, 183, 188, 196, 197, 199, 202, 239, 240, 248, 252, 253, 257, 258, 267, 270, 305-307, 309, 312, 314, 315-318, 323, 324, 327-329, 337-339, 340, 341, 349-351
- Colonial question — 10, 22-23, 31, 89, 97
- See also:* National-colonial question
- Colonies — 22, 23, 25-27, 30, 31, 33-36, 39, 40, 43, 47, 48, 88-92, 98, 99, 104, 110-112, 113, 117, 120, 123, 133, 138, 152, 166-168, 269, 306, 309, 312, 323, 331, 333, 338, 340, 341, 342-347, 358, 366, 367
- Communism — 19-21, 49, 58, 59, 116, 138, 194
- Communists — 11, 40, 52-57, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70-72, 80, 81, 83, 98, 112, 114, 180, 183, 184, 187, 188, 191, 197, 260, 261-264, 265, 286, 325, 326, 347

Conferences

- Bandung (1955)—198, 203, 206, 253
- Colombo (1976)—205
- Lourenco Marques (1975)—371
- Luanda (1976)—372
- Lusaka (1970)—205

Declarations

- Burmese Road to Socialism policy document—267, 280, 294, 298
- Dar-es-Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa—333, 334, 336
- Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 1960—306-308

Decolonisation—306, 307, 308, 331, 347, 349, 356, 366, 367

Detente in international relations—193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 207, 252, 254, 365

Dictatorship—55, 71, 95, 121, 126, 161, 164, 169, 247, 329

- of the proletariat—21, 45, 59-60, 64, 71, 85, 97, 100, 121, 123, 159, 161

Gandhism—244, 250, 258

General crisis of capitalism—31, 33, 61, 64

Imperialism—9, 10, 15, 21-22, 24, 25, 27-31, 33, 36, 39-44, 48, 49, 54, 55, 59-61, 63, 71, 81, 82, 87, 91-92, 95, 97, 104, 108-114, 115, 118, 119-121, 133, 134, 136-138, 141, 142, 143, 153, 154, 158, 162, 166-168, 180, 183, 184, 186, 187-193, 196, 198, 202, 252-254, 257, 261, 263, 264, 267, 269, 271, 272, 290, 306, 308, 310, 311, 312-318, 323, 324, 325-328, 338, 339, 342, 343, 349, 356, 366, 367-368, 371-376, 380, 384, 386

Independence—136-138, 188, 192, 201, 254, 258, 306, 308, 310, 327-328, 350, 381

- economic—35, 51, 109, 113, 161, 168, 202, 265, 268, 315-318, 348, 350

- national—13, 14, 34, 106, 120, 139, 142, 150, 182, 183, 193, 202, 247, 257, 259, 267, 269, 306, 308, 313, 317, 323, 344, 376, 377, 381

- political—28, 82, 109, 113, 137, 142, 150, 152, 161, 202, 265, 269, 306, 316, 323, 350

International communist and working-class movement—22, 25, 33, 49, 55, 56, 62, 72, 80, 81, 90, 100, 148, 184, 193, 272, 286, 314

Internationalism—10, 110, 134-136, 145, 192, 305

- proletarian internationalism—11, 31, 38, 72, 112, 144, 148, 260, 272

Internationals

- First International—18, 19-21

- Second International—15, 17, 21-22, 29, 30, 98, 379

- Third International (Comintern)—47, 49, 58, 80, 95, 97, 103, 104, 110, 115, 121, 260-261, 264

Law of the uneven development of capitalism—31, 59, 61-63, 64, 86, 87, 91, 137

Manifesto of the Communist Party—9, 11, 72

Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties

- 1960—84, 148

- 1969—106, 148, 188, 305, 311, 313, 328, 343

Middle strata—55, 118, 286, 357

Military political blocs—142, 201, 202, 206, 309, 327

- ANZUS (Australian-New Zealand-US defence pact)—202

- ASPAK (Asian Pacific Council)—202

- CENTO—142, 202

- NATO—310, 315, 340, 341, 346, 356, 368

- SEATO—142, 202, 266

National bourgeoisie—31, 38, 39, 49, 54, 97, 118, 154, 157, 168, 186, 251, 260, 261, 269, 293, 298, 319, 384

National-colonial question—22, 27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 37, 43, 58, 134, 137

- See also:* Colonial question, National question
- National democracy — 42, 51-58, 61, 82, 83, 100, 101-103, 106, 119, 126, 155, 156, 157, 159-161, 162, 169-171, 179-181, 183, 184, 186, 187, 189-191, 261, 277-278, 285, 286, 289, 298, 325, 326, 359, 361, 378-380, 383, 384
- Nationalisation — 124, 126, 129, 157, 178, 270, 280-282, 284, 298, 303, 316, 344
- Nationalism — 14, 32, 38, 39, 82, 83, 99, 101, 113-114, 116, 118, 135, 139, 140, 143, 145, 148, 151, 170, 180, 186, 260, 261, 264, 272, 273, 320, 345, 379-381, 383, 384, 386
- National question — 7, 9-11, 15, 17, 19, 22, 29, 32, 37, 38, 97, 98, 112, 131-138, 142, 143, 145, 146, 148
- See also:* National-colonial question
- self-determination of nations (national self-determination) — 10, 15, 17, 22, 25, 30, 32, 33, 38, 43, 44, 82, 134-138, 141-143, 200, 257, 296, 307, 322, 328, 332, 334
- National-revolutionaries — 50, 52, 54, 113, 115, 182, 246, 256-260, 271, 322, 324
- "Nehru line" — 252-254
- Neocolonialism — 34-35, 111, 113, 114, 120, 121, 126, 131, 138, 142, 156, 166-168, 180, 183, 186, 205, 206, 252, 253, 305, 309, 312-315, 322, 323, 327, 342, 356, 362, 366, 367, 376, 382, 383
- New Economic Policy (NEP) — 123-125
- Non-alignment, policy of — 198, 206, 253, 348
- Non-capitalist development road — 34, 50-55, 58-63, 81, 84-87, 92, 94-103, 104-106, 115, 116, 120, 123, 124-130, 150, 152-156, 157-159, 162, 181, 187, 188, 191, 263, 265, 268, 269, 270, 279, 286, 287, 289, 308, 310, 313, 319, 324, 378, 382-383
- See also:* Socialist orientation
- Opportunism — 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 29, 31-33, 56, 70, 98, 144, 260, 289
- Organisation for Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia and Africa — 372
- Organisation of African Unity (OAU) — 311, 327, 333-335, 348, 363, 365, 370, 372
- Parties — 9, 13, 14, 21, 34, 51, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 109, 119, 130, 147, 159, 162-163, 165, 168, 181, 183, 186-191, 206, 261, 271, 288, 292, 293, 325, 326, 330, 332, 335, 336, 337, 343-346, 379
- Communist parties — 37, 41, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 56, 66, 68, 69, 81, 83, 85, 101, 110, 118, 132, 134, 140, 143, 145, 147, 159, 162, 182, 183, 187, 189, 206, 259, 260, 262-264, 269, 272, 344, 347
- Communist Party of Burma — 265-266
- Communist Party of Indonesia — 82
- Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) — 80, 98, 106, 108, 114, 117, 118, 132, 134, 135, 136, 143-145, 147-149, 153, 194, 195, 202, 207, 350, 351, 365
- Communist Party of Sri Lanka — 83
- Indian Communist Party — 83, 259, 260
- Iraqi Communist Party — 139, 171, 262-264
- Other parties
- African National Congress (ANC) — 343, 344, 345, 350
- African Party for Independence in Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC) — 343, 344, 348, 350
- Arab Socialist Renaissance Party (BAATH) — 139, 171
- Burma Socialist Programme Party — 267, 273, 277, 287-289, 292, 293, 297, 303
- Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) — 343, 344, 348, 349, 350
- Indian National Congress — 245-247, 251-252, 255, 256, 261
- Kurdish Democratic Party — 139
- National Front for the Li-

- beration of Angola (FNLA)—336, 362, 365-372
- National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA)—336, 365, 367, 369-371
- Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA)—343, 344, 350, 357, 358-372
- South-West Africa People's Organisation(SWAPO)—334, 335, 336, 343, 344
- Tanganyika African National Union (TANU)—172
- Zimbabwe African People's Union(ZAPU)—343, 344, 345
- Peaceful coexistence—194-199, 203, 206, 207, 252-254
- Peace Programme—149, 194-195, 198, 202
- Peasantry—8, 10, 12, 13, 23, 28, 29, 33, 39, 40, 41, 45, 55, 56, 60, 70, 81-83, 90, 94-95, 99, 100, 101, 102, 116-119, 121-125, 126-129, 130-132, 140, 143, 146, 147, 159, 169, 182, 245, 261, 263, 270, 276, 283-285, 286, 288, 293, 295, 296, 299, 320, 324, 326, 337, 343, 351, 359, 364
- Proletariat—7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-22, 24-26, 29-32, 37, 41, 44, 46-49, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 67, 69, 70, 97, 101, 110, 111, 112, 118, 120, 123, 125, 133-136, 155, 161, 170, 182, 183, 186, 187, 288, 289, 320, 384, 385
- Racism, racialism—39, 110, 113, 148, 196, 197, 199, 239, 252, 253, 272, 309, 310, 312, 314, 327-329, 331, 333-336, 337, 340, 341-344, 345, 346, 350, 369, 371-376
- Reformism—22, 27, 46, 54, 84, 117, 120, 157, 244, 247, 248, 249, 251, 377, 378
- Revolutions—7, 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 37, 40, 41-43, 45, 46, 49, 57, 58, 59, 66-71, 90, 93, 95, 106, 108, 109, 112, 114, 115, 117, 121-125, 130-133, 146, 151, 153, 162, 165, 166, 168, 171, 178, 180, 186, 261, 290, 323, 324, 335, 376, 385
- agrarian revolution—12, 16, 17, 95, 123, 132
- democratic revolution—7, 9-10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 30, 31, 39-48, 49, 54, 55, 57, 58, 62, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 102, 103, 131, 151, 162, 186, 249, 307, 308, 314, 340, 347, 383
- Great October Socialist Revolution—25, 30, 32, 36, 41, 44, 59, 90, 112, 123, 131, 133, 134, 145, 146, 256, 257, 307
- national liberation revolution—25, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38-43, 48, 80, 82, 83, 87-90, 106, 109, 110, 114, 117, 123, 131, 133, 134, 151, 152, 162, 168, 179, 185, 188, 189, 262, 263, 269, 271, 343, 351, 370, 383
- proletarian revolution—9, 10, 17, 24, 29, 30, 36, 46, 90, 95, 253
- socialist revolution—9, 10, 25, 27, 29, 36, 37, 42, 43-48, 49, 51, 54, 58, 63-65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 85, 92, 95, 99, 101, 103, 110, 114-115, 118, 124, 131, 133, 151, 159, 197, 246, 258, 261, 263, 383
- Security—195, 196, 197, 198, 205-207, 252, 254, 310
- collective security in Asia—201, 202, 207, 254
- Social Democracy—14, 22, 70, 111, 112, 295, 381
- Socialism—28, 31, 32-36, 42, 44, 48, 50-55, 57, 58-65, 67, 80, 81, 85, 86, 87, 90-94, 95-100, 101, 103-106, 110-118, 121, 124, 127, 135-138, 141, 143-145, 146, 147-150, 152-157, 158, 162, 168, 178, 179, 183, 184, 188, 191, 196, 197, 200, 201, 207, 244, 246-250, 252, 254, 267, 268, 271-273, 276, 286, 287, 288, 289, 294, 296, 303, 310, 313, 324, 333, 344, 350, 351, 376-386
- “National socialism”—155-157, 272
- scientific—9, 26, 29, 36, 38, 51, 52, 54, 55, 64, 66, 69, 85, 88, 90, 92, 95, 103, 105, 112, 113, 117, 119, 121, 130, 134, 149, 150-152, 159, 165, 183, 184, 186, 187, 191, 243-246, 248, 250, 259, 260, 262, 271, 273, 277, 287, 294, 326, 348, 351, 379, 380, 382, 384, 386

- transition to — 36, 50, 51, 60, 61-65, 81, 84, 87, 88, 90, 99, 106, 108, 115, 118, 150, 168, 179, 183, 186, 244, 246, 259, 263, 267, 269, 285, 287, 315, 323
- Socialist community — 36, 52, 80, 99, 104, 111, 117, 119, 154, 181, 192, 193, 198-200, 201, 207, 264, 272, 297, 307, 314, 333, 365, 370, 372, 376
- Socialist orientation — 34, 51, 58, 81, 85, 101, 106, 151, 154, 155, 156, 158-162, 163, 165, 180, 199, 291, 294, 296, 308, 313, 326, 378, 382, 383
- Socio-economic change — 34, 55, 57, 82, 101, 108, 125, 126, 131, 139, 146, 147, 153, 155, 161, 171, 179, 190, 191, 201, 245, 246, 263, 273, 280, 287, 317, 322, 324, 326, 385
- Union of anti-imperialist forces
See: Anti-imperialist front
- Union of the working class (proletariat) and the peasantry — 29, 40, 68, 95-97, 120, 122, 132, 263, 288
- United Nations Organisation (UN) — 199, 200, 204, 306-309, 329, 330, 336, 341, 345, 349, 350, 371
- Wars — 17-21, 24, 30, 90, 111, 139, 140, 192, 196, 202, 250, 251, 345, 346
 - civil — 17-18, 19, 69, 90, 132, 146, 265, 267, 298
 - colonial — 25, 90, 328, 338, 346, 347, 366
 - First World War — 19, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, 44, 207
 - Second World War — 27, 33, 42, 194, 285, 322
 - national liberation — 18, 30, 90, 133, 134, 141, 345, 369
- Working class — 10, 11, 17-22, 24, 34, 40-45, 46, 49-51, 55-58, 63, 65, 69, 70, 82, 83, 88, 98, 115, 118, 120, 121, 130, 132, 143, 150, 151, 156, 159, 161, 162, 169, 182, 188, 189, 248, 259, 261, 263, 268, 270, 276, 277, 288, 293, 295, 296, 320, 324, 326, 344, 347, 357, 379
- World revolutionary process — 32, 36, 66, 67, 72, 96, 108, 110, 112, 133, 155
- World socialist system — 33, 61, 90, 101, 104, 118, 307, 309, 316, 317, 322, 382, 384
See also: Socialist community

Name Index

- Amanulla Khan — 117
Araujo, Manuel Gomez de — 364
Aung San — 286
- Bebel, August — 19
Bismarck, Otto — 13, 20
Boumedienne, Houari — 173
Bowles, Chester — 167
Brezhnev, Leonid Ilyich — 98, 104,
106, 146, 160, 194, 195, 197, 198,
200, 202, 203, 205, 220, 222, 223,
224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230,
231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237,
254, 311, 373
- Caetano, Marcelo — 90, 338
- Dange, S. A. — 262
- Engels, Frederick — 8-9, 11-16, 18-
23, 25-26, 29, 35, 49, 57, 65, 71,
85-95, 99, 101, 105, 220, 275, 279
- Gandhi, Mahatma — 117, 249, 250,
261
- Ho Chi Minh — 193
Houphouët-Boigny, Félix — 342
- Kautsky, Karl — 25
Kemal Atatürk — 72, 117
- Lassalle, Ferdinand — 19
Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich — 9-10, 13-
15, 17, 19, 21-22, 24, 26-33, 34,
35-38, 43-46, 47-49, 50, 58-61, 64,
66, 70-72, 73, 74, 75, 79, 80-81,
95-100, 101, 103, 105, 107-108, 109,
110, 113, 115-125, 130-135, 137,
138, 141, 142, 143-144, 148, 155,
156, 159, 182, 202, 208, 209, 210,
211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217,
218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 228, 230,
238, 245, 246, 253, 259-262, 264,
268, 380, 385
- Liebkecht, Karl — 19
Luxemburg, Rosa — 29
- Marx, Karl — 7, 9-21, 22-26, 29, 30,
34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 44, 47, 48,
49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 57, 59, 64, 65,
66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 79, 80, 84,
85-86, 88-95, 96, 99, 101, 103, 105,
220, 245, 250, 269, 279
- Napoleon III — 20
Nasser, Gamal Abdel — 117, 178
Nehru, Jawaharlal — 117, 239-255
Nehru, Motilal — 245
Neto, Antonio Agostinho — 231,
357, 358, 362, 365, 371, 373, 374,
375
Ne Win — 280, 286, 295-297

Pratap, Mahendra — 257
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph — 11, 17

Roberto, Holden Alvaro — 359, 361-
362, 365, 366, 368-370

Roy, Mahendra Nath — 75, 260,
261-262, 263, 264

Salazar — 90, 338

Savimbi, Honas — 365, 368, 369, 370

Schweitzer — 19

Senghor L. — 272

Smith, Ian — 310, 331, 332, 341

Spinola, Antonio — 347, 367, 368

Sukarno, Ahmed — 117

Sun Yat-sen — 117

Tilak — 256

Tsedenbal, Yu. — 99

U Ba Swe — 266, 287

U Kyaw Nyein — 266, 287

U Nu — 266, 286, 297

Van Kol, Henrik — 21, 22

Vorster — 331, 332, 333, 336

Waldheim, Kurt — 335

Wilson, Thomas Woodrow — 142

Youlou, Fulbert — 363, 365

Geographical Names

Afghanistan — 133, 145

Africa — 18, 33, 52, 55, 56, 61, 76, 80, 81, 84-85, 86, 89, 90, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 109, 115, 118-120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 151-153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 162, 168, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 192, 197, 198, 199, 205, 208, 209, 212, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 247, 253, 264, 268, 271, 272, 273, 274, 305-308, 309-326, 327-330, 331-333, 334, 335, 337, 338, 339, 340-346, 349-351, 352, 354, 359, 365, 367, 369-372, 376-378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384

Algeria, People's Democratic Republic of Algeria — 25, 84, 111, 125, 129, 136, 152, 173-178, 198, 268, 307, 319, 333, 348, 378

America — 16, 115, 133, 186, 194, 195, 322, 382

Angola, People's Republic of Angola (PRA) — 136, 198, 225, 236, 305, 310, 331, 336, 337-339, 341, 343, 346, 347, 349, 356-375

Asia — 18, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 38, 39, 44, 52, 55, 56, 60, 61, 76, 80, 81, 84-85, 86, 97, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 109, 115, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126, 128, 129, 130-134, 136, 137, 138, 141, 151-153, 155, 156,

157, 158-159, 168, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 192, 194, 197, 198, 199-208, 209, 212, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 242, 245, 246, 253, 264, 268, 271, 272, 273, 274, 298, 300, 306-308, 310, 313, 316, 317, 318, 322, 328, 352, 354, 385

Australia — 25

Austria — 12, 17, 18, 19, 42

Bangladesh, People's Republic of Bangladesh — 143

Belgium — 315, 338, 341, 358, 359, 368

Benin, People's Republic of Benin — 154, 310, 324

Biafra — 142

Brazil — 369

Britain — 7, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 51, 65, 93, 94, 142, 148, 198, 206, 216, 239, 240, 244, 247, 248, 257, 258, 331-332, 338, 341, 368

Burma, Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma — 84, 126, 129, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 152, 160, 163, 164, 178, 247, 265, 266, 267, 268, 273, 274, 277, 279, 280, 281, 283, 284, 285-287, 288-297, 298, 299-304

Canada — 25, 51, 148, 195, 207, 315

- Cape Verde Islands — 347, 348
- China, People's Republic of China (PRC) — 21, 22-24, 25, 26, 30, 50, 80, 83, 89, 119, 133, 203, 216, 217, 237, 274, 289, 293, 297, 298
- Congo (Kinshasa) — 137, 314, 365, 366, 368, 369, 371
- Congo, People's Republic of the Congo — 84, 125, 153, 179, 309, 319, 324
- Cuba — 79, 111, 198, 307, 372, 374
- Cyprus — 143
- Czechoslovakia, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic — 194, 285
- Egypt, Arab Republic of Egypt (ARE) — 21, 96, 145, 153, 160, 178, 202
- Ethiopia — 125, 310, 324, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355
- Europe — 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 42, 44, 47, 59, 64-65, 86, 88-90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 100, 111, 112, 115, 122, 132, 133, 134, 186, 194, 195, 197, 202, 207, 228, 233, 241, 243, 244, 298, 322, 331, 378
- France — 7, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 194, 198, 313, 315, 368, 369, 371
- Gabon — 342
- Germany, Federal Republic of Germany — 7, 9, 10-13, 18-19, 38, 51, 108, 133, 194, 309, 314, 315, 341, 368, 369
- Ghana — 119, 310, 314
- Guinea, Republic of Guinea — 84, 125, 152, 164, 178, 319, 348, 378
- Guinea-Bissau, Republic of Guinea-Bissau — 84, 115, 136, 153, 198, 305, 324, 337, 339, 341, 343, 346-349
- Holland, the Netherlands — 7, 21, 25, 42, 198
- Hungary — 8, 9, 11
- India — 15, 21, 22-26, 30, 31, 58, 76, 80, 83, 89, 93, 96, 133, 137, 138, 142, 143, 167, 202, 205, 213, 217, 239-242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248-250, 251, 252-255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 268, 274, 289, 298
- Indochina — 80, 143, 192, 193, 199, 224, 230
- Indonesia — 50, 82, 136, 137, 138, 143, 205, 268, 309
- Iran — 30, 96, 145, 215
- Iraq, Republic of Iraq — 78, 79, 83, 84, 125, 129, 133, 137, 138-140, 143, 145, 152, 171, 172, 205, 306
- Ireland — 9, 11, 15, 16, 21, 134, 148
- Israel — 202, 342
- Italy — 9, 11, 42, 89, 120
- Ivory Coast — 156, 333, 342
- Japan — 33, 89, 91, 133, 136, 212, 274, 286, 298, 314, 315
- Kampuchea, Cambodia — 202, 225, 234
- Korea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea — 98, 100, 202
- Kurdistan — 172
- Laos, Lao People's Democratic Republic — 79, 153, 198, 202, 225, 230, 234
- Latin America — 61, 105, 108, 115, 120, 133, 181, 186, 192, 198, 201, 220, 222, 264, 306-308, 318, 322, 328
- Liberia — 156
- Libya — 271, 319
- Madagascar, Democratic Republic of Madagascar — 153, 310, 342
- Malaysia — 83, 156, 205, 268
- Mali — 119, 310
- Mauritius — 342
- Mongolia, Mongolian People's Republic (MPR) — 51, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 133, 159, 206, 216
- Mozambique, People's Republic of Mozambique — 84, 136, 152, 198, 305, 310, 331, 337-339, 341, 343, 346, 347-349
- Namibia — 230, 232, 305, 310, 332, 334, 335, 336, 340, 343
- New Zealand — 202
- Nigeria — 137, 141, 309, 314
- Pakistan — 137, 142, 145, 202, 268, 289, 298
- Palestine — 201
- Philippines, Republic of the Phi-

- Philippines — 83, 156, 205, 268
 Poland, Polish People's Republic (PPR) — 8, 9, 11-14, 16, 195
 Portugal — 25, 89, 90, 198, 224, 230, 234, 253, 308, 327, 329, 332, 335-341, 342, 343, 344, 345-348, 356, 357, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365-367, 368, 370
 Prussia — 7, 11, 12, 17, 19-20
 Republic of South Africa — 148, 152, 200, 225, 230, 232, 309, 310, 314, 315, 327, 329-343, 344, 345, 346, 350, 356, 368, 369-372
 Southeast Asia — 61, 115, 120, 126, 141, 193, 205, 268, 297
 Spain — 25, 42, 134
 Sri Lanka — 83
 Sudan — 137
 Syria — 78, 79, 83, 84, 125, 129, 145, 152, 163, 178, 307
 Tanzania, People's Republic of Tanzania — 84, 125, 152, 172-173, 319, 324, 333, 363
 Thailand — 205, 268, 293
 Transkei — 337
 Tunisia — 378
 Turkey — 18, 30, 42, 133, 145, 215
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Soviet Union, USSR, Russia — 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 24, 30, 32, 36, 38-40, 41, 42, 44-45, 50, 59-60, 64, 74, 81, 89, 93-94, 95, 98, 100, 101, 104, 108-112, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130-134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 141-145, 147, 148, 149, 156, 159, 165, 193-195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200-207, 208, 209, 210, 214, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 226, 227, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239-240, 245, 249, 254, 255, 256-259, 261, 285, 305-307, 311, 314, 346-351, 360, 372, 374, 375, 376
 United States of America, USA — 17, 18, 23, 51, 141, 148, 167, 194, 198, 201, 206, 207, 266, 287, 298, 309, 314, 315, 329, 341, 345, 351, 359, 368, 371
 Vietnam, Socialist Republic of Vietnam — 79, 83, 98, 100, 111, 136, 193, 198, 202, 203, 225, 234, 307
 Yemen — 84, 125, 129, 152, 164, 178, 310
 Zaire, *see* Congo (Kinshasa)
 Zambia — 332, 333, 336, 340, 363
 Zanzibar — 173
 Zimbabwe — 232, 305, 331, 334, 340, 343

Request to Readers

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Редактор русского текста *В. А. Батасова*
Контрольный редактор *Л. К. Нахапетян*
Художник *В. Л. Анохин*
Художественный редактор *Ш. Г. Джигоев*
Технический редактор *Т. В. Левина*

Сдано в набор 17.3.1978 г. Подписано в печать 24.10.1978 г.
Формат 84×108 ¹/₃₂. Бумага офсетная № 1. Гарнитура
таймс. Печать офсетная. Услови. печ. л. 21,0. Уч.-
изд. л. 25,85. Тираж 9 220 экз. Заказ № 30. Цена 1 руб.
40 коп. Изд. № 25346.

Издательство „Прогресс“ Государственного комитета
СССР по делам издательств, полиграфии и книжной
торговли. Москва 119021, Зубовский бульвар, 17.

Отпечатано на Можайском полиграфкомбинате Союз-
полиграфпрома при Государственном комитете СССР
по делам издательств, полиграфии и книжной тор-
говли. Можайск 143200, ул. Мира, 93.

This book deals with the contemporary national liberation movement. It presents the Marxist-Leninist concept of non-capitalist development and shows the international significance of Soviet experience in resolving the national question.

The author also examines the role played by the classes and their parties in the national liberation struggle, the united anti-imperialist front and the more significant features of national-democratic states, the impact of international detente on the developing countries and their part in the bid for collective security in Asia.

The author of the book Professor Rostislav Ulyanovsky has had two of his previous books translated into English, *Socialism and the Newly Independent Nations* (1974) and *Asian Dilemma: A Soviet View and Myrdal's Concept* (1975) (the latter book is written in collaboration with V. Pavlov).